THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXV DECEMBER, 1937 No. 210

EDITORIAL

The condition of the world grows more and more distressing. It would be faithless to say that war seems to be coming nearer. Truer is it to say that war is becoming more and more difficult to prevent. Germany's natural desire for colonies, Italian and Japanese ambitions, a Spanish war out of which several nations have seen a chance of making political capital, are all very dangerous things. The geographical, political and economic magnitude of the British Commonwealth, while it seems to the smaller nations, and to ourselves, a bulwark of peace, is resented by many of the larger powers. Add to this fear, as felt, for example, in France, the hatreds of Fascism and Communism for one another, the temptation that visits a dictator, when he has begun or suspects that he may soon begin to be discredited, to risk a catastrophe, the economic pressure felt almost everywhere, and the strength of the hope of gain as a motive, and you have another formidable array of predisposing causes. Add finally the evil passions which are latent in all men and are apt to come to the surface when any difficulty of circumstances provides an excuse for kicking over the traces, and the Kingdom of God may seem a remote, even a fantastic ideal. There is a feeling in the air that war is not likely at present for the base reason that no one is quite ready for it, at least not on any gigantic scale, but that a number of the diseases from which the world suffers are hastening to their crisis.

The crisis of a disease, even if it be a complication of disorders, is not necessarily fatal. There are occasions when it is both true and wise to remind ourselves that things must be worse before they are better. What hope is there that things ever will be better? There is one hope, sometimes uttered, which arises out of pure pessimism. It is one form

of the argument that things must be worse before they are better, but it is not what we mean. Mr. Bertrand Russell in *The Way to Peace* is disposed to believe that, if war can be staved off for several years, the range and destructiveness of air-fighting will have increased so much that America, the strongest nation of the world, will have been brought into the danger-zone and will accordingly be driven to work for peace in some new and effective way. It way be so, but it is a pessimistic sort of hope. There is in Mr. Russell's philosophy a strong, even a noble belief in human nature, but he declines so resolutely to avail himself of the Christian hope or of any kind of religious reinforcement that his faith in humanity seems to have nothing to rest on. It is pessimistic. All it can do is to argue that, unless the whole cosmos of civilization falls to pieces altogether, we shall presently touch bottom, and then there will be some kind of rebound.

Our own hopes are grave and serious. The sick-room is no place for frivolity, and forced gaiety, always boring, would be repulsive there. Christian hopes, at the bedside of civilization, must have a sombre quality. If a crisis is approaching, it is right to be anxious. But the ground of such hopes as we put forward is reliance upon known positive forces, together with the probability that something will emerge. The word "emerge" is used deliberately rather than "be given from on high" or other expression of that kind. The belief that God will "intervene," to use a term which even Coleridge once allowed himself, is really a heresy. It springs from a defective apprehension of the Biblical faith in the Living God, the God who does things, and moreover, in doing them, does not disdain the apparatus of human character and human achievement which already exists. Deutero-Isaiah cries, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God," and he goes on to say partly:

The glory of the Lord shall be revealed—

but partly also:

"Prepare *ye* in the wilderness the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God."

It is, in fact, in spite of the Barthians, a co-operation.

The reason why "emerge" is a proper word, theologically sound, is that the Incarnation has recharged human nature with new power. Mankind has been regenerated. That is why the appeal of a Parochial Mission or of a National Recall

to Religion is a call to stir up an already existing and available gift. It is for the most part an appeal to the baptized. Even in so far as it must contemplate the presence of a number of unbaptized persons in its audience, it is entitled to treat them as persons who are aware of Christianity, who have lived neighbours to it, who themselves share in the latent virtue of that which Christ has given to the whole human race. Anyhow, to the baptized it says: " Be what you might be, be what you are called to be." As the King of Babylon, when he recovered from his madness, found that he was a king and had always been a king, so those who from early years have been called to be saints can be converted and resume the sanctity of their true vocation. Thus something humanly quite unexpected but divinely natural will " emerge."

This is the burden of Canon Barry's recent book *What has Christianity to say?* (S.C.M., 5s.). Our religion, he repeats, is not a futile havering between Right and Left. On which side shall we register our modest, hesitating contribution? Shall we present a pair of white velvet gloves to the Right, in the hope that the iron hand of discipline may mitigate the rigour of its grasp? Or shall we try to qualify the blood-red banner of the Left and give it a churchmanly pink border? Neither the haberdashery nor the tailoring would be effective, and neither of the expedients would satisfy our real vocation. Canon Barry declares that the present hatred of the Left for the Right and of the Right for the Left is a temporary, almost accidental thing. The real conflict is between State-regimented paganism on the one hand and Christian freedom on the other. If Christendom could become what Our Lord means it to be, no power of world or flesh or devil could stand up against it. Is not that the meaning of the " tomorrow " which rings out in the liturgical antiphons and versicles for Prime and Terce and Sext and Nones of Christmas Eve?

Would that be because the Church would then rule the world? Would find a third point of the compass, neither Right nor Left, from which to dominate? God forbid! What would then have come to pass would be that the world had found a new conscience, the flesh would have begun to taste the promise of redemption, and the devil would have been bound, if not for the ten thousand years of Scripture, at least on a long lease. It is better, in the matter of the alleged or the expected binding of Satan, to avoid freehold language,

and even the idea of the conventional millennium, because "security is mortals' chiefest enemy," and one of the devil's favourite devices is to sham dead, or to operate with such dexterous, and sinister, anonymity that the fact of retirement is presumed. But if the Church flamed out everywhere into Christian indignation against sin, his kicks and squeals would be a warning against false confidence and yet impotent to spoil God's world.

If only! The philosophy of "If only" is often criticized. But that is when the "if" desiderates some impossible reversal of the course of nature, as that human beings should be sexless, or selfless, or immortal, or some other non-human thing. The "if" then partakes of the character of the Semitic hypothetical found here and there in the Greek Testament. The *Ei dothesetai semeion* of St. Mark viii. 12 is rightly translated by "There shall no sign be given." But there are other kinds of "if" in the Bible. There is a doubtful one, spoken without faith, but later astonished by a divine event and swallowed up in victory. "If the Lord should open windows in heaven, might this thing be?" This was said, be it noted, by the captain on whose hand the king leaned, and it is rather the tone, we will not say of the Household Troops, but of Cabinets or of highly placed permanent officials of the State. It is the tone of those who themselves lean on the arm of flesh. But there is another "if" in the Bible. An example occurs (in the Greek) at Romans v. 6: "What if, while we were yet weak, in due season Christ died for the ungodly!" That illustrates the kind of "if only" that Canon Barry has in mind. His "if" introduces nothing more than an application of the virtue of the Pauline reminder. It proceeds, in fact, from the Gospel itself.

So Dick Sheppard, priest, good comrade, reincarnation of the spirit of Saint Francis, has passed into the state of life where the happiness of love for our Lord and of sympathy with men is not marred by the pain of living in an unjust and cruel world. We recall him as an undergraduate at Trinity Hall, filled then, as we learned afterwards, with self-distrust, but seemingly a most attractive and delightful young man. It was not surprising to find him very soon chosen to be the Head of the Oxford House or to be the one clerical member of the Cavendish Club. From that point he gradually went on to become the friend of all the world. He penetrated so deeply

into the territory of his friends that his own lines of communication with his base were sometimes in danger of being cut off. Not in all ways. Not in the way that matters most. His air-contacts were always in order. He never lost touch with Heaven, or the confidence which that brings. But his contact with the Church was apt to wear thin. It is not for those whose less adventurous ways lead them into less temptation and achieve less usefulness to blame him, but it was the fact. *The Impatience of a Parson* ought to have been given as Retreat Addresses to the clergy. It sounds fantastic to say of it, as Joshua Watson said of Tract XC, that it ought to have been written in Latin, because Dick could never have written it in Latin, and the clergy either could not or would not then have read it. But it was not a book to be put out *urbi et orbi*. And yet it was an extraordinary testimony to the Church that it had produced and could still nourish the man who wrote it. Like all his work, it was the fruit of a living faith. The love that men had for him was very far from being due merely to his own attractiveness. That would not carry a man over the miles that he travelled towards the heart of the world. The world is much too shrewd for that. It likes a smiling face, but it demands more than a smile before it will pledge itself. It was because everybody knew that his nature was radiant with the light that comes from the *Lux Mundi*. And if he did sometimes provoke people to remark rather bitterly, "How different he is from all other clergymen!" it would have been a fair comment that, bitterness apart, there was much truth in that. We must needs say *Requiescat*, because that is the true language of both piety and charity. But we have a feeling that Dick himself would rather hear us say *Surgite, eamus hinc*. And if that *eamus* should look like leading us, as it led our Master, from a Gethsemane to a Calvary, we feel that Dick would have added in his winning way, "But you don't mind that, do you? You're Christians."

THE VICTORIAN COMPROMISE

After all that has been written about the Victorian Age it is tempting to turn to it as the subject of a paper, and attention has been lately redirected to it by the publication of *Religion in the Victorian Age* by Dr. Elliot-Binns and the Life of Bishop Connop Thirlwall by his great-grand-nephew. The titles also of Dr. Wingfield-Stratford's amusing trilogy are suggestive, *The Victorian Tragedy*, *The Victorian Sunset*, *The Victorian Aftermath*. The closing lines of Thirlwall's Life indicate a profitable enquiry:

"Thirlwall's importance to his own age—his contribution to the Victorian Compromise—is exceedingly interesting to a modern student of the history of thought. Basically sceptical, and, in another sense, basically religious, he made an honest compromise between faith, as represented by the formularies of the Book of Common Prayer and the body of traditional Christian doctrine, and reason, as represented by the new scientific knowledge."

Pascal, whose irony Thirlwall greatly admired, made a similar adjustment, in the seventeenth century:

"Seeking some certainty in a turmoil of doubt aroused by the conflicts between reason and rationalism, he had learned to combat Cartesian scepticism with an even deeper scepticism —Pyrrhonism—and with a defiance more gallant than that of the Fathers had flung his *Credo quia impossibile* into the face of modern thought. The central problems of life—the co-existence in the same person of virtue and vice, of grandeur and misery, of faith and reason—Pascal reconciled by raising men's spirits above immediate concerns to an ironical aloofness possible only on the via media."*

The Compromise offers us one key to an understanding of the strength and weakness of the Victorian Age. Consider the English Church in the early decades of the century. In spite of Arnold, Keble and Newman, and certain reforming Bishops, she was tainted with Erastianism, ready to acquiesce in Parliamentary interference, high-handed as it was, if only she could retain some of her material privileges from the impending catastrophe. But even so her power was considerable. Otherwise that astute Victorian Uncle, Leopold of Belgium, would not have advised his niece, on coming to the throne, to cultivate it. "You cannot, without *pledging* yourself

* *Life of Thirlwall*, p. 23.

to anything *particular*," he wrote, "say too much on this subject." It is interesting, too, to recall two illuminating comments on A. P. Stanley, that most vivid and picturesque of Victorian Deans, the friend and adviser of his Sovereign.

Bishop Creighton, in a letter from Oxford describing the effect of one of Stanley's sermons, writes, "There was a certain amount of general moral enthusiasm—to the intent that it was desirable to be good rather than bad; but I had previously gathered that from other sources"; and R. W. Church records his impressions when writing in 1865 to J. B. Mozley: "What is this nineteenth-century religion for which all things have been preparing, and to which all good things, past and present, are subservient and bear witness? He (Stanley) seems to me in the position of a prophet and leader, full of eagerness and enthusiasm and brilliant talent, all heightened by success—but without a creed to preach. I suppose he would say that testifying for liberty and the love of truth and tolerance is a sufficient creed. But it can only be to intellectual people, and the world in general is not of that sort."*

Socially the Age was one of unbounded prosperity, and it is impossible to exaggerate, writes Dr. Binns, the power and importance of the landlords. It can be gathered from the dying words of Tennyson's farm-bailiff, "God Almighty little knows what He's about a-taking me. An' Squire will be so mad an' all," which recall Monckton Milnes' remark on the poem that "people did not mind Tennyson's printing 'god' with a small letter since he kept the capital for 'Squire.'"†

To make the best of both worlds for the unheeding seemed the line of least resistance, but the Compromise in the intellectual sphere was vulnerable from two sides. The Romantic Movement found its English counterpart in the Oxford Revival, and the rising tide of German rationalism flowed strongly in the direction of Biblical criticism which merged itself later in the frontal assault of the scientific movement.

It is interesting to speculate on the persons who made the really great contribution of an abiding nature to the formative influences of nineteenth-century theology. Archdeacon Storr regards Coleridge, Newman, Schleiermacher as the biggest people. The Dean of Exeter gives a place also to Bentham, Mill, and Darwin, and Dr. Elliott-Binns is kind enough to give me as his choice Coleridge, Newman and Maurice. Connop Thirlwall, whose biography suggested this enquiry, was not in that class, though in his time he was a liberalizing influence, open to new truths, and he ranked very high in the councils of the bishops.

* *Life of Thirlwall*, p. 280. † Quoted Elliott-Binns, p. 16.

Hort of course was important as a New Testament scholar and as one of those who introduced modern Biblical scholarship into Cambridge. His Hulsean Lectures, *The Way, the Truth and the Life*, are by many regarded justly as one of the greatest books of the last seventy years, a deep mine of thought. He cannot be ranked as high in general thought as Maurice, who brings us into touch with a group of attractive personalities of liberal outlook. Liberalism effected a compromise by dispensing with Christian dogma and tradition while preserving the ethics. We in this generation have seen the partial abandonment of the ethics and realize that the old tag with a slight amendment is true: "super-naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret."

Oriel and Balliol at Oxford were the centres of such menacing efforts. Cambridge found its leaders in Thirlwall and Julius Hare, both of whom were Fellows of Trinity. Hare alone is a study in himself. He left Cambridge to become the Rector of the family living of Hurstmonceaux, where he amassed a vast library of German books, and his liberal opinions—derived mainly from German scholars—on the Atonement and Inspiration attracted a good deal of notice. He was opposed to the "mocking-bird of Tractarianism," as he called it. Among his pupils at Trinity was F. D. Maurice. He was not a parish priest. "What is a living worth?" he said. "Heaven or Hell as the occupier does his duty." And sick people are reported as saying, "Mr. Hare do come to us, and he do sit by the bed and hold our hands, and he do growl a little, but he do say nowt." His long sermons, above the heads of his rustic flock, earned him a strange title; "Mr. Hare, he be not a good winter parson"—for it was in the summer only that they got home before dark. "He was a fine specimen of Squarson . . . unfortunately he was without humour save once, when he permitted himself to say in reference to his picture gallery that he kept seven Virgins! By a saving grace most of them were three hundred years old! His services in church were varied with impromptu. Sometimes he gave a thrilling representation of Lady Macbeth from the pulpit. He also had the oddest way of turning over the pages with his nose."*

His curate was another remarkable person, John Sterling, also a member of Trinity and the leading member of the Apostles Club. He gave up the clerical life for the career of letters, and charming as his two volumes of collected essays are, he finds his chief claim to fame in the Life which Carlyle wrote. "The book is remarkable for its inversion of the usual proportion between biographer and hero. Johnson for once writes upon Boswell."

* *Men are Different* (Shane Leslie on Augustus Hare, pp. 93-94).

Of Newman's inspiration and influence even a short estimate in impossible. The fascination of his personality is unique and by far the best modern study of him can be found in Geoffrey Faber's *Oxford Apostles.*

Coleridge is not so well known, but his was one of the seminal minds of the century and his influence was an all-pervading and indirect one. He left no systematized philosophy, but his thought is controlled by the conception of the supreme reality of the spiritual world, and the fact that man is a unity, a living and growing organism, who assimilates religious truths only through the movement of his whole nature. To that extent he may be termed a mystic, for he was convinced that man is capable of holding living communion with God. Such communion is possible because man is a sharer in the Divine Nature. Coleridge's influence is so great and far reaching that even its most outstanding conceptions cannot be summarized in a paragraph, but with regard to the speculative difficulties which may well co-exist with a reasonable faith, and the place of reason as contrasted with rationalism—one of his greatest achievements—Coleridge insists that anyone who would fairly approach the study of Christian evidences must remember that Christianity is not primarily a theory or a speculation but a life and a living process. " Try it," is his advice to the doubter.

F. D. Maurice* was a disciple of Coleridge and had the distinction of being the only Anglican of the period with a really adequate metaphysical training and a knowledge sufficient to give him a right to an opinion of philosophical subjects. His great achievement was to make men realize that eternity was not time extended but time abolished. By learning to know God men came to share in eternal life and at the same time to surrender their individual lives " to that universal Energy which is the very life of God." His religion was founded on the nature of God and not on man's notions of Him.

He therefore rejected the Evangelical theory by which the " sinful man and not the God of all grace " is made the foundation of Christian theology. He regarded the Church as the source and inspiration of human fellowship; as human society rescued from the abnormality of the world, and restored to communion with God. Man's own dissatisfaction and despair come from his inability to be satisfied with the temporal and from his slavery to selfish objects. " Anything is better than this dark self. I cannot bear to be dogged by that, night and day; to feel its presence when I am in company and when I am alone; to hear its voice whispering to me—' Whithersoever

* *Vide* Elliott-Binns for an excellent estimate of his thought and influence.

thou goest, I shall go. Thou wilt part with all things else, but not with me.' "

He was not a Broad Churchman. He was a " dogmatist to the backbone and repudiated all advocacy of vague and watery creeds." Nowadays he would be called a Liberal Catholic, but with no party badge. Certainly the vague undogmatic religion, which the man-in-the-street finds so attractive, would have aroused his scorn. As for the Broad Churchmen, " Their breadth seems to me to be narrowness. They include all kinds of opinions. But what message have they for the people who do not live on opinions ?" In *The Kingdom of God* he gloriously chants the praises of the never dying and never ageing Creeds of Christendom.

Schleiermacher has been described as the acknowledged founder of modern theology, making a contribution infinitely more enduring than the more famous Hegel. An excellent summary of his system and estimate of his influence can be found in Archdeacon Storr's great book on the *Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century*. *The Christian Faith* is the best illustration of his thought, and it opens with a definition of religion as a specific feeling of our dependence on a power outside ourselves. This feeling, says Schleiermacher, is a basal fact of our constitution, an immediate and original experience, universal in its range. It is an ultimate fact that the soul is immediately aware of God. To what extent the personal is swallowed up in a pantheistic conception, under the influence of Spinoza, is too difficult a question to be considered: what is of crucial importance is the acknowledgment that the religious experience is prior to the intellectual construction. In Christianity the specific feeling is that of redemption, but such a faith can only exist in the Christian community, hence the emphasis which is placed on the Sacrament of Holy Communion. The cause of this Experience is none other than Christ, whose Person alone can explain the faith, and the creative power of Christ in human history is one of the determinative principles of Schleiermacher's thought. The high place which is given in modern ways of thinking to religious experience in its widest and best sense, and to that specific type which is called mystical, derives from Schleiermacher, although the Catholic tradition of Western mysticism goes back in unbroken continuity to Augustine and Bernard and the writings of St. Teresa and John of the Cross.

But Schleiermacher was supreme in non-Catholic circles, where it is hard to overestimate his influence. Of his chief work *The Christian Faith* (1821) Seeberg said that it " taught

the nineteenth century its theology," and two quotations from Dr. Sydney Cave's book are of interest:—

"It is this Renascence of Wonder that Schleiermacher introduced into Christianity."*

"By it (the Christian Faith) the old controversy between Rationalists and Supernaturalists was superseded. Rationalists had protested against the demand for obedience to external authority: Supernaturalists had insisted that Christianity was inexplicable, except by God's creative act. Schleiermacher united the truths for which each party stood, and succeeded, where both had failed, in delivering theology from intellectualism, by interpreting theology, not as a series of dogmatic propositions to be accepted on the authority of the Bible or Church, but as the developing expression of a redemption which is essentially connected with the person of the Redeemer. Christ is final. Theologies are local and transitory. The Christian experience is prior to the intellectual interpretation of it."†

That is in the tradition of historic Lutheran theology. The obvious danger of Schleiermacher's thought is its one-sided subjectivism, too much stress being laid on the "experienced" and not enough on what von Hügel has called the "given-ness" of Christianity. Yet he did succeed in giving centrality to Christ.

"He helped to save the Church from vain disputes and to lead theology back from all lesser tasks to the supreme task of seeking to understand the Person and work of Christ, and of interpreting through these both God and man."‡

Hermann's *The Communion of the Christian with God*, one of the important books of the century, representative of the Ritschlian school, shews clear traces of Schleiermacher's influence, and his greatness is recognized to-day by the fact that a hundred years after his death Brunner thinks it necessary to join battle with him. With Brunner the vital issue is this, either Schleiermacher or the Reformation: either Schleiermacher or the Word. It is his philosophy of mystical immanence that challenges the dominant Barthian conception, and the following passage reveals how great is the reaction in Protestant theology to the older point of view.

"That which 'since Schleiermacher has become a reed-truth,' that the kernel of religion is immediate consciousness, experience, feeling, not thought, creative originality, and that in it the question, What is true ? is only to be answered from the other, What is the experienced ?—this whole romantic sub-

* *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, p. 160. † *Ibid.*, p. 170

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 173.

ectivism, to which the 'How' is so much more important than he 'What,' which made the question about the religious conciousness the fundamental theological question, made faith 'irrational experience,' revelation 'originality of the religious genius,' and which separated the Word from faith itself, and made it mere reflection upon faith—all that which is the kernel of Schleiermacher's doctrine of religion has become doubtful to us, and more than doubtful, and behind this formulation of the question all the individual problems of the inquiry into Schleiermacher step into the background."*

These were the greatest minds of the century in theological speculation, and although Connop Thirlwall is not of that high distinction, he takes a very high place among the great Victorian Liberal Churchmen. One can see his bust in Westminster Abbey next to Grote's, whose history of Greece, published simultaneously with Thirlwall's, eclipsed from the beginning the reputation of the latter. Connop Thirlwall was born on February 11, 1797, became Bishop of St. Davids in 1840, and died on July 28, 1875. If, as Dr. Wingfield-Stratford says, the Victorian Age should be regarded as ending about 1870, and the remaining years as *fin de siècle*, then Thirlwall is a very good example of Victorian eminence.

In 1809 his father published a volume of his eleven year old son's writings, entitled *Primitiæ*. The first of the thirty-two sermons, which, according to the *Gentleman's Magazine*, "would not disgrace the pulpit," on the *Uncertainty of Life* was composed at the age of seven! His school life at Charterhouse was crowned by a brilliant career at Trinity College, Cambridge, of which society he became a Fellow, leaving it only after a controversy on the admission of Dissenters and on compulsory chapels. Throughout his life he was dominated by the rise of German theology. He collaborated with Julius Hare in a translation of Niebuhr's *Rome*; this in itself was sufficient to make him an object of suspicion. He added to that by his publication of a *Critical Essay on the Gospel of St. Luke*, being a translation of Schleiermacher's *Lukas*.

He left Cambridge after a quarrel with Whewell and Wordsworth, the Master of Trinity, and was presented by Lord Brougham in 1834 at the age of thirty-seven, as a reward for his Whig opinions, to the lonely and lucrative living of Kirby Underdale, near York. Here he remained, completing his history of Greece, and paying visits to London, until in 1840 he was appointed to the remote diocese of St. Davids. The circumstances of the appointment are amusing and instructive.

* *Mysticism and the Word*, p. 11, quoted by Chapman in his *Introduction of Schleiermacher*, p. 131.

"'Very glad to see you' (said Melbourne); 'sit down, sit down; hope you are come to say you accept. I only wish you to understand that I don't intend, if I know it, to make a heterodox bishop. I don't like heterodox bishops. As men they may be very good anywhere else, but I think they have no business on the Bench. I have read a good deal of those old fellows,' pointing at a pile of folio editions of the Fathers. 'They are excellent reading and very amusing; some time or other we must have a talk about them: I sent your edition of Schleiermacher to Lambeth, and asked the Primate to tell me candidly what he thought of it; and look, here are his notes in the margin; pretty copious, you see. He does not concur in all your opinions; but he says there is nothing heterodox in your book.'

"It would be interesting to know what Thirlwall managed to interject amid this torrent of words and what he thought of the selection of a bedroom for the bestowal of his mitre. We are only told that 'briefly and without blandishment' he responded 'to the appeal made to his sense of religious honour . . . and nothing could be more alien to his feelings than any reservation of conscience or thought of insincerity in accepting it.' The story runs that the last thing Melbourne said, as Thirlwall was leaving, was, 'I have done you a favour by presenting you with a bishopric; now I want you to do me a favour in return.' The nominee expressing his readiness to comply, Melbourne exclaimed, 'Then what the devil made you translate Schleiermacher?' Unfortunately, Thirlwall's reply is lost."*

Among the Welsh hills and in his Palace at Abergwili he lived in lonely isolation, finding much pleasure in the company of children, and in his cats and dogs and geese, and little or no pleasure in the society of his illiterate and uncouth clergy. The later years of this shy and illustrious scholar were brightened by a curious and charming episode. He formed a close friendship with Miss Betha Johnes, the daughter of a Carmarthenshire squire, and somehow at the age of nineteen she began a correspondence that lasted for the remaining thirteen years of his life. These letters to Miss Johnes were edited by Dean Stanley, and they form some of the most interesting of all Thirlwall's writings.

What then is Thirlwall's place in the Victorian Age? His real significance lies, we would suggest, in his massive and judicial intellect. His mental capacity and range of interest were both immense. His *Charges* were justly famous and his opinions and judgments—invariably on the liberal side—were

* *Life of Thirlwall*, pp. 109-14.

widely respected. He was a court of appeal in episcopal difficulties, but he was not a great Churchman like Samuel Wilberforce, the true founder of modern clerical efficiency. Thirlwall's influence was steadying and, liberalizing in an age of acute transition, moral rather than religious, undogmatic, cold, rational. His great contribution was to keep the forum open for the discussion of fundamental questions, but those questions he despaired of answering. His biographer most admirably sums up his theological position in these words: "His pronouncements . . . will lead one to conclude that he was a rationalist who took little comfort in the emotional evasions of many Christians—that even the sublime mysteries of Christianity troubled rather than comforted him, that his religious ideas and feelings found scant guidance in the body of traditional Christian doctrine. But his gravely ironic and sceptical spirit, finding the best code of ethics in Christianity liberally interpreted, evolved a highly practical religion for nineteenth-century England."

We have dealt at some length with the Bishop of St. Davids because he seems most typical of the Broad Churchmen and because until recently the facts of his life have not been widely known. This study suggests another and wider question. What was the real contribution of the Broad Church Movement and what place can we assign to it in Victorian England ?

It was in its origin a Cambridge Movement, and started in a club whose official name was the Cambridge Conversazione Society, called inevitably the "Apostles," its membership being limited to twelve. It included many famous names: Sterling and Maurice, liberal Churchmen; Trench and Merivale, Archbishop and Dean; the Tennysons, Milnes and Arthur Hallam. According to Thirlwall's biographer the "Apostles" Club was the cradle of the Broad Church Movement, and its characteristic principles are admirably anticipated in the following marginal note of Kemble's copy of Thirlwall's *Letter to Thomas Turton on the Admission of Dissenters to Cambridge.*

"No society ever existed in which more freedom of thought was found consistent with the most perfect affection between the members, or in which a more complete tolerance of the most opposite opinions prevailed. I shall say nothing of what the actual and former members of that society have done; but very few of the distinguished Cambridge men of our time have not been members of it; and it existed to remedy a fault of our education. Its business was to make men study and think on all matters except mathematics and classics professionally considered. Its metaphysical tendency has altered (first in

Trinity) the system of University examinations itself. . . . To my *education* given in that society I feel that I owe every power I possess, and the rescuing myself from a ridiculous state of prejudice and prepossessions with which I came armed to Cambridge. From the 'Apostles' I, at least, learned to think as a *free man*."*

The Cambridge curriculum needed a sharp awakening, and the Apostles, stimulated by Thirlwall and Hare, turned their minds to the philosophy of religion and the reformation of studies at the University. This need found expression in 1830 in Tennyson's *Alma Mater*:

> "Therefore your Halls, your ancient Colleges,
> Shall not avail you, when the day beams sport
> New-risen o'er awakened Albion. No!
> . . . Because your manner sorts
> Not with this age wherefrom ye stand apart,
> Because the lips of little children preach
> Against you, you that do profess to teach
> And teach us nothing, feeding not the heart."

The second stage was London, and again a club. The "Apostles" was revived by a group of Cambridge graduates, and the "Sterling Club," immortalized by Carlyle, came into existence. The composition of its membership, which included many of the most distinguished minds of the time, men of varying interests and outlook, "the witty, the worthy, the wise and the inspired," reveals an outstanding characteristic of the Broad Churchmen. They delighted in the society of the leading lay minds of their time. They kept the Church in touch with the best secular thought, and they in turn earned the respect of the scientists and critics.

In Thirlwall's case this is clearly shewn in his friendship with John Stuart Mill and Carlyle. "His speech was in answer to one of mine," wrote Mill; "before he had uttered ten sentences, I set him down as the best speaker I had ever heard, and I have never since heard anyone whom I placed above him."†

Carlyle visited the Bishop at his Welsh home and has left a typically caustic account of his visit. He was not an admirer of bishops; "'stupid, fetid, animals in cauliflower wigs and clean lawn sleeves,' he called them at Tennyson's one night —'Bishops, I say, of the Devil—not of God—obscene creatures, parading between men's eyes and the eternal light of Heaven' —even Carlyle augured well of his friend, 'the massive Cantabrigian Scholar and Sceptic,' who would make a 'Macready

* John William Adamson, *English Education*, 1789-1902, Cambridge, 1930, pp. 72-3. Quoted Thirlwall, p. 56.

† Mill is recording in his Autobiography his impression of Thirlwall, aged 28.

of the Episcopacy,' comparing him in typical Carlylean fashion to a noted actor."

The Victorian Broad Church Party was clearly a product of its age, and it came to an end with the closing of the era. Modernism, as it has developed in the school of Loisy and Tyrrell, has nothing in common with it, and modern Liberalism has left it far behind. It has no direct descendants. The Victorians were sometimes more conservative than they liked to appear, and Thirlwall, no iconoclast, as he himself confesses, is a very typical representative. He reminds us of Dr. Sanday in his impartial championship of unpopular causes. He defended the grant to Maynooth College in the House of Lords, he defended the first "Tracts for the Times," he was in favour of admitting Jews to civil rights, he defended Gorham against Bishop Philpotts, and he came out on the orthodox side in the controversy which raged around *Essays and Reviews*. The *Charges*, so justly famous, in spite of their reputation for dullness, can still be read with attention, and they are masterpieces of massive learning, judicious and erudite, the utterances of a statesman. Nor are they devoid of spiritual appeal. As an illustration of Thirlwall's style, one quotation may be given from the Charge delivered September and October, 1848, in which he crosses swords with Newman and addresses himself to the burning question of Papal Infallibility:

"For those who have been trained to look up to it with unquestioning veneration, this absence of all external warrant may create no difficulty. To them it may be sufficient to say, that 'belief is in itself better than unbelief; that it is safer to believe; that we must begin with believing, and that conviction will follow.' But for anyone who has not been subject to the influence of such associations, who is required to make a deliberate choice, and to stake his all upon the adoption of a new belief, to content himself with such presumptions and guesses and ventures after the truth, as those which form the best substitute this author has to offer for 'accurate proofs,' would argue a want either of judgment or of seriousness, which it may be hoped will not be found in that class of readers for which his work is designed. Nor will that singular combination of the extremes of scepticism and credulity which it exhibits in a degree almost without precedent recommend it to those who value either freedom of thought or earnestness of faith. To minds constituted and predisposed like his own, it may undoubtedly minister a welcome plea for yielding to that sentimental and imaginative bias, which . . . appears to have been the real cause of his own secession, and which alone

enabled us to reconcile the respect due to his abilities and attainments with the esteem which we should wish to feel for his character."*

In their introduction to *Great Victorians*, the editors call attention to what they consider a clue to the appreciation of the Age. "A popular conception of the Victorian Age is that it was a stagnant one, intrinsically derivative in thought and art. Actually it was an age when leading minds, as in the Renaissance, *began to explore* in every direction. There can be no doubt that our own minds, suspicious, probing, experimental, meditative, owe a great deal to the courage and impetuosity with which the Victorians pioneered us into fields of scholarship and science, *where they had not yet the right weapons to conquer.*"

The Broad Churchmen were among the notable explorers, but with the weapons which they possessed their contribution was bound to be a Compromise, and therefore and inevitably impermanent.

The best commentary on the failure of the Compromise is the history of the English Church as it is revealed in the life of Archbishop Davidson, a story of fifty years of Church history in which the leading ecclesiastic of his time, a man greatly revered and beloved, looked the great problems of his day full in the face, and passed on to leave this generation to solve them. This may have been inevitable, and probably was, but it affords a sure explanation of our present difficulties. For the Compromise has broken down. The generous liberalism of Thirlwall and Stanley is now only of historic interest. It is a spent force. The Church is narrowing her frontiers in face of an uncompromising hostility and indifference. New Testament criticism is compelling us to admit that what we know of Christ comes to us through the interpretation of the Church. It is to the first century that we turn to find inspiration for our present difficulties. We too are a remnant. Christianity, we have come to recognize, is a historic religion with very definite theological foundations and moral implications. The Compromise has failed, but the great Broad Churchmen can still teach one thing worth remembering, and that is that an introverted Church, preoccupied with its own security and anxiously self-conscious about its own institutional concerns, is not really true to its mission. Dr. F. R. Barry has reminded us that this was the real weakness of the Tractarians. "They believed that the right way to revive the Church as a living society in its own right, not a mere religious department of the State, was to close the ecclesiastical frontiers. They

* *Remains*, i., p. 105.

resisted all liberal speculation. They refused to recognize changing circumstances. . . . With the great issues stirring in the world in the pregnant period of the Reform Bill they seem to have felt no religious concern. It is, surely, a singular coincidence that at the moment when Mr. Keble was preaching about National Apostasy, the House of Commons was passing into law its most conspicuously Christian measure."*

The Broad Church ideal of identifying the National Church and the State is no longer tenable in the form in which it was once held; but the belief that religion is an essential concern of every man, not merely an optional interest, and that to the Christian Faith nothing is secular except sin, is a conviction which we in this generation ignore to our peril.

A. F. JUDD.

THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF RELIGIONS: THE PRESENT POSITION†

THERE are at least five ways of approaching the comparative study of religions. First there is the attitude typified by the Neo-Protestants of the Continent, who (reverting to the original position of Luther) distinguish between " die Religionen " and " das Evangelium," and regard every kind of human religion as a questionable activity, starting from the wrong point, leading to the wrong place, and destined to be condemned by God Himself, whose Word alone can direct and save. Next there is that adopted by a teacher at one of the Scandinavian universities: " All religion being illusion, its study is merely a branch of archæology or sociology." Third, there is the attitude exemplified by the Nazi professor J. W. Hauer, and (as it seems) by Dr. L. P. Jacks in his recent Hibbert Lectures, page 65‡: " Every hitherto existing form of religion is relative." Fourth, there is the attitude of the scientific observer, who, whatever his private beliefs and preferences, thinks it his duty to conceal them, and to confine himself to the task of making an impartial and classificatory description of actual data. This was the method pursued by Professor A. G. Widgery in his Mysore Lectures of 1915, and it is the only proper method for any public academic lecturer to adopt.§ Fifth, there is

* *The Relevance of the Church*, p. 177 (the Measure for Slave Emancipation).

† An expansion of a lecture delivered in 1937 in the University of Cambridge.

‡ *Trent. Sessions* XXIV, Canon 7, p. 195.

§ Between the third and fourth there might be a sub-type, in which the student of religion claimed to classify religions into good and bad types, judged by some external standard of his own choice.

the attitude of the believer, who, while ready to study other faiths, still not only believes but outwardly affirms his belief in the supremacy of his own. This would be the attitude of the Indians, Radakrishnan and Mukerjee, of the Japanese Suzuki, and of the American H. H. Gowen, and it is also the position adopted by Dr. Otto Karrer, whose book was reviewed in THEOLOGY last November.

Whether a satisfactory study of religions can be made by a Christian from this standpoint depends upon the consideration of a number of factors, chief among them being the actual position in the world which the Christian religion appears to occupy at the present time. There certainly was a period when the view of it adopted by J. W. Hauer seemed to many eminent scholars the only tenable one—a period marked by the celebrated passages in Charles Darwin's letters, and by the publications begun under the guidance of Max Müller. But today the situation is different. In spite of "Nordic" nationalism and dialectic pan-cosmism it is increasingly evident that if any religious future awaits mankind, its fortunes are in some way bound up with some form of Christianity. The view of Adolf Harnack is still not *quite* out-of-date, though we might today express it differently: "In dealing with the Christian Gospel, one is dealing not with *a* religion, but with Religion."

The further questions, of course, arise at once: "With what Christianity?" "With an imperishable kernel?" "With an existing form?" "With some form yet to be developed?" "With something dialectically related to it?" Unless there be a *continuant* which passes on from type to type, it might seem that to predict that any future form of religion would be called "Christian" just because it seemed to be a final form into which mankind was settling down would be to make a question-begging if not an unwarrantable assertion.

A now obsolete method of settling these questions was to say that the teaching of Jesus Christ had a unique capacity for uniting and combining all the spiritual values scattered outside it. But this, as Tröltsch saw, only bestows upon Christianity a relative superiority. It makes it "the best religion up to the present," and enables us to say: "I believe (but only 'believe') in its future supremacy." It is now plain that if Christ is merely a teacher of a special unifying doctrine (as seemed to be the view of Harnack) such a supremacy is today harder, not easier, to believe in. In any case it is also plain today that no Christianity would have come to exist at all if its original propagators had been merely those who continued to proclaim a piece of good advice, or a theory first

proclaimed by Jesus. There never was an apostle who did not preach "a gospel about Jesus." Still more, even in a critically extracted residuum of synoptic tradition the original Jesus is seen to have come to possess "a belief about God and Himself," and is moved to do certain acts as the consequence of that belief. As Bultmann has said, "Nicht das Was, sondern das *Dass* seiner Verkündigung ist das Entscheidende." Hence, as Dr. Karrer rightly concludes in his Chapter X, faith in a discontinuous and unrepeatable action of Deity, released in and through Jesus, belongs to the continuant element in the Christian religion, so that it conditions all subsequent forms of it, and is the criterion of its various developments. Even if we have scruples about describing the Christian Event as a miraculous intrusion, and treat it as an intensification and discontinuous interruption of the general course of events due to Divine overruling "in the fulness of time," this element of uniqueness and once-for-all-ness remains undisturbed. The relation of this discontinuous act to the continuous creative and sustaining activity of a Deity who is both transcendent and immanent is guaranteed by some form of logos-doctrine, which is at any rate congruous with the discoveries of scientific research as to the nature and development of the physical universe. The act itself is also analogous to the discontinuous acts which occur in the lives of human beings. It is only the *solitary* uniqueness claimed for this special piece of discontinuity which troubles some thinkers—*i.e.*, what is called "Das Aergernis der Einmaligkeit."

Thus there are those who would consider the incursion of the cult of Dionysus into Europe a discontinuous event, and who would say: "Why single out one special discontinuity and stamp it as absolute?" The answer to this was, I think, well given by a friend of mine the other day. He quoted the saying, "There are good European cathedrals and there are bad European cathedrals—and there is Chartres!" and left us to work out the implication.

But this claim of Christianity to have introduced a special unique element into life accounts for the indisputable fact that it has actually made prominent in human thought about religion the category of "absoluteness" which was not present before. It also accounts for its unique capacity for combining spiritual values. It is not "the best religion" because it does so. On the contrary it does so because it is something more than the best religion (viewed as a piece of human endeavour), something even more than the general revelation which admittedly exists beyond its borders. Yet this "something more," says Karrer, is not discoverable by the scientific comparative study of

religions. Such study will yield a comparative superiority to Christianity. But a *salto mortale* is necessary before anyone can accept the full claim of the Christ. Here it would seem that the Catholic and Neo-Protestant virtually join forces. A genuinely religious attitude, says Dr. Karrer, must reject any rational criterion which would make Man the measure of God, and submit the Divine to human personal or national standards. When we come face to face with the Absolute God, there is no longer any place for debate or comparison, but only for worship and submission. It is important to consider the validity of this claim. The Anglican Hooker declared that we know by *reason* when the Word of God is communicated to us. Does this make Man the measure of God, or is it rather that reason is God's own prevenient gift to man, and that God, having bestowed it, henceforth deals with His creature as a rational person? This needs to be thought over most carefully by anyone who would seek to bring together not only the *disjecta membra* of Christendom but also the religious forces of the world as a whole.

It is beyond dispute that in certain circles the comparative study of religions is now less in favour than twenty years ago. Luther, as we saw above, drew a clear distinction between "Das Evangelium" and "Die Religionen," and included Catholicism under the latter heading. Modern Neo-Protestantism on the Continent of Europe, taught by Barth and Heim, has tended to reaffirm this distinction.* Probably the logical development of "Liberalismus" which led Ernst Tröltsch ultimately to find "polymorphous truth" in all the great creative religious systems of the planet has alarmed a good many earnest Christians, and even Albert Schweitzer's views seem to have undergone a certain amount of disintegration since he delivered his Selly Oak lectures after the Great War. It remains to be seen whether British and American Protestantism will be much affected by this reaction. So far as our own country is concerned, it appears that comparative studies are more in favour in Free-Church than in Anglican circles, possibly because since the publication of Dr. Estlin Carpenter's works they are mistakenly supposed to tend in the direction of Unitarianism; and there can be no doubt that in so far as Barth has found Anglican disciples, the latter have adopted the prejudices of their prophet both with regard to the philosophy of religion and also with regard to non-Christian religious systems.

But this is only a part of the picture. Not only is Christian

* It is no secret that Dr. Nicol Macnicol's excellent lectures on non-Christian religious systems, delivered in 1935 at the International Theological Seminar at Geneva, were treated with suspicion, even if not actually boycotted, by many Central European students.

missionary work undertaken today with more respect for the cultural and religious inheritance of would-be converts. Not only are increased intercommunication and broadcast talks about distant lands quickening popular interest. The rapid development of the young science of anthropology and the immense increase in archæological research have also directed attention in expert circles as well as outside them to the problem of religion, regarded as a human phenomenon.

The result is both drastic and salutary. The scientist is inclined to scoff at much that has hitherto passed for comparative study. He thinks it tendencious. The object of the Christian being to prove the superiority and if possible the absoluteness of his own faith and practice, he is disinclined, says the scientist, to study other religions dispassionately. Hence a great deal of what has been written during the past fifty years is treated as untrustworthy, either because it has been written in the interests of missionary propaganda or because on the other hand it has too enthusiastically espoused the cause of non-Christian religions which it did not really know intimately and in consequence misperceived, singing their praises with the spirit rather than with the understanding.

We are now therefore being encouraged to make a fresh approach, and to study the whole complex of religious phenomena, both past and present, without any presuppositions or prejudices. Of course there have been for a long time people who have tried to make such a study; but they are now on the increase, and on both sides the subject is being lifted out of the realm in which bias prevails, whether pro- or anti-Christian. It is seen to be just as unscientific for the lecturer in comparative studies to indulge in missionary propaganda as it was for Sir James Frazer to discourse on Old Testament folk-lore in a literary style which left no doubt as to the writer's intense dislike for orthodox Christianity* and his contempt for the primitives. Those of us who are Christians have to learn to work with enough faith in the truth of our religion to be sure that it cannot suffer by being placed side by side with other systems. Those of us who are not Christians must learn equally to treat Christian phenomena fairly and without prejudice. We must *never* prescribe the conclusions before we reach them.

Now the results of this fresh impetus given to comparative studies fall under two heads, and are concerned with:

1. Material.
2. Method.

* Compare with this the totally different temper of Dr. R. R. Marett's *Faith, Hope and Charity in Primitive Religion* and *The Sacraments of Simple Folk*, Gifford Lectures, 1931-33, and also his Donnellan Lectures, 1933: *Pre-Theological Religion*.

1. *Material.*—To compare anything with anything else we must know both things. Therefore our first need is material, accurately recorded and properly understood.

In almost every direction we see a vast increase in the data at our disposal. To begin with, the older translations of sacred books are rapidly becoming out of date, and scholars are at work providing us with better ones. It is obviously a handicap not to be able to read these books in the original, but such intense specialization is needed for this purpose that most comparative students must needs rely on the expert linguist, and it is therefore the business of the latter to furnish them with a version which will not only enable them to penetrate to the mind of the writer or prophet, but also to make them feel the difficulty of doing so. There must be no facile westernizing of Oriental concepts. What we get in the end may seem crabbed and clumsy, and sometimes entirely different from that to which we have hitherto been accustomed, but it is nearer to the truth, and therefore *must* be accepted.

America is joining hands with England in producing these new versions, and the latest translation of a Buddhist text is by Lord Chalmers, but is published at the University of Harvard. Versions of the Upanishads and of the Gita have appeared in India as well as in this country, but one of the best known renderings of the former is by Professor R. E. Hume of New York, and is published at the Oxford University Press.

For those who can read German a very interesting source-book was compiled and issued in 1922 by Professors Lehmann and Haas, to serve as a companion to Professors Bertholet and Lehmann's great fourth edition of the text-book of Chantepie de la Saussaye. Messrs. Dent have made Romesh Dutt's abridged version of the Ramayana and Mahabharata (with its stimulating notes and introductions) accessible to all British students by issuing it in the Everyman Library, and the late Professor Langdon and Sir Wallis Budge have given us new and interesting texts in English from Babylonia* and Egypt† respectively. The work of the Pali Text Society in collating Buddhist literature is too well known to need commendation. Even the Bible itself is not exempt from this movement. Not only have we Moffatt, but also the re-rendering of individual books, such, for example, as that of Jeremiah by Dr. Skinner, which is of infinite value. Shorter texts are constantly appearing in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (edited from Lund by Professor Nilsson) and in the *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, among these the new Iranian

* Especially the Ishtar liturgy.

† Especially the moral discourses of Amen-em-Apt and others.

apocalypse, published in 1932 in French, which throws light both on Jewish and also on Germanic eschatology. Mention should also be made of the important Ras Shamra texts,* which supply fresh information about early Canaanite religion, and also of the various new Manichæan documents, especially those being studied by Mr. C. R. C. Allberry,

This reconsideration of texts and language may easily lead in one special instance to rather surprising results, namely in the matter of primitive Buddhism. Supposing that Mrs. Rhys Davids is right (and Miss Horner, Przyluski, and the other researchers in this field seem to be endorsing her conjectures), we may yet have to write down Gautama as a sort of Pelagian Quaker, who told his followers not " to be lamps-unto-themselves " (this is said to be an inadmissible rendering of the word " attadīpa ") but " to be men-who-have-the-Self-as-a-lamp," and " to seek for the Self within them "—the Self or Pūrusha roughly corresponding (as Professor Burkitt said a week before his death) to the Inner Light or the Holy Spirit." Again, proper understanding of the doctrine of *wu-wei* or " non-resistance " will shew, I think, that it is a foreshadowing of an attitude towards evil which has both its signal example and its supreme vindication in the Cross of Jesus.†

In the second place, field work and archæology are providing us with accurate observations regarding the cultus and beliefs (both living and defunct) of the different races of mankind. It is only necessary to quote the work of Sir Leonard Woolley at Ur, of Sir John Marshall at Mohenjodaro, and of such observers as Mr. J. P. Mills among the Nagas of Assam, and Mr. C. L. O'Malley among the Dravidian peoples of South India by way of illustration. Films of religious ceremonies have been taken, and much careful photography has resulted in the acquisition of excellent records. There is a new and altogether more sympathetic spirit of observation prevailing both at home and abroad. Even in England, folk-lore studies are found to be capable of making work in country parishes wiser and more understanding.

In the third place, some of the new non-Christian movements, however unwelcome they may be, are providing fresh information as to the way in which similar movements generated in the past. Dialectic materialism is better understood when studied in comparison with Indian Sāmkhya doctrine and

* Mostly published in French periodicals, but there is now at least *one* English version.

† Gautama might in this way almost be said to be a Christian before Christ, and if Justin Martyr had been acquainted with his teaching he might have included his name in the famous passage (*Apology*, I. xlvi., §§ 1-4).

Hinayana Buddhism or Chinese impersonalist philosophy, or even with Greek scepticism. There is also a more than superficial resemblance between state Shinto and Nazi leader-worship.

2. *Method.*—Attempts at framing a general theory of religion go back in England at least to Lord Herbert of Cherbury, who died in the year of the Peace of Westphalia; but his information regarding non-Christian faiths was both scanty and superficial. Closer to our own day is the sympathetic survey which occurs in Bishop Westcott's *Gospel of Life*, where, especially in Chapters IV and V, although he shews himself strongly influenced by the work of Deussen and Max Müller, he has much that is valuable to say about "the Prae-Christian solutions of the problems of life," and is extraordinarily modern and far-seeing in his judgments regarding the teaching of the Buddha. The almost meticulous accuracy and general fairness which we associate with Westcott's work are entirely in harmony with the traditional spirit of British science as pursued in the University of Cambridge, a spirit which is nowhere more clearly manifest than in such a vast monument of comparative studies as Dr. A. B. Cook's *Zeus*, now just approaching its final instalment.

Before, however, any *théorie générale* can be more than a provisional one, much linking up is still needed, and many gaps remain to be filled. The idea that a universal religion has replaced or is in process of replacing a number of local religions looks as though it would have to be abandoned sooner or later for the idea of one universally diffused level of religion (with local variations) giving way to another. The main thesis of the "Golden Bough"—*i.e.*, the existence of a uniform zone of religion and society, belting the old world at a remote era from the Mediterranean to the Pacific—would seem to have been established.* We must then speak of a diffused ethnic religion (or at any rate of a concurrently developing ethnic or nature religion) with a corresponding cultus, giving way to a universally diffused prophetic type of religion (a process not yet complete). But we may also profitably learn to distinguish between the ethnic open-air cultus and the ethnic cultus associated with "god-houses," the dwellings of the "grand seigneur" type of deity, "men and women of a larger growth," and note also that just as this type of cultus overlaps into Catholicism with its churches and cathedrals, so the prophetic type overlaps into ethnic worship through the diffusion of Orphism and Dionysiac cultus by wandering prophets who convey them to other lands than those of their origin.

* See the epilogue to Sir James Frazer's *Scapegoat*.

For the purpose of understanding the golden age of creative religion we must learn to treat 800 B.C. to 300 A.D. as a single epoch, and Asia from the Ægean to Japan as a single block, the parts of which are interrelated. The pace at which ideas travel may have varied from age to age, but no greater mistake can be made than to suppose that the peoples of this planet have lived and developed in total isolation from one another. Art-forms have travelled amazingly in bygone ages, and along trade routes must have gone not only beads and pottery, but also ideas, new thoughts about the Self-Existent or Numinous and about the Good Life.* Of course we cannot always be sure which way the process went, whether from east to west or from west to east, or from some point between, going in both directions; whether, for example, the ideas of "living according to nature" and of "the middle way" originated in Greece or in China first, or whether in both at different times, or in some third area, whence they spread both eastward and westward. In matters relating to the doctrine of God it is somewhat startling to find Indian thought in the Isa Upanishad anticipating the natural theology of St. Thomas Aquinas.

The idea of the Eternal as a stable entity subsisting behind the evanescent, and appearing in localized manifestations, is one such idea, and it is worth while comparing the resemblances and also the great differences between the various forms of this idea and the terminology used to describe it, whether as Shekinah, Memra, Pūrusha, Li, Tao, Kami or Spermatikos Logos. There is, of course, a possible use of the term Logos (and thus also a possible interpretation of the Fourth Gospel) which may be very agreeable to the Oriental, and may mislead people into thinking that he is quite easily adopting Christianity, but which is really incompatible with the special Christian conception of one supreme Divine Initiative. It all depends on whether you think the Eternal is engaged in a cyclic and recurrent or in a purposive and teleological activity. You cannot have it both ways.

* It is by no means beyond the bounds of possibility that air-photography and digging as well as the explorations of travellers may eventually connect up the "henge" monuments of Britain with the Altar of Heaven in China; for Palgrave in his *Travels* (2nd edition, p. 146) mentions three circles in Arabia to the north-west of the Nejed, similar to the one on Salisbury Plain, while Ferguson in *Rude Stone Monuments* gives a long list of many more, in Ireland Lombardy, Persia, Algeria, North-West India, Assam and elsewhere, and the Peking Altar is only one of many such in China, and seems to represent a sophisticated form of open-sky cultus which thus stretches from the Atantic eastward to the Pacific. Baron von Heine-Geldern of Vienna has lately claimed to shew that certain definite spiral patterns in decoration, which occur during the Hallstatt period in Europe, have travelled through the Caucasus across the north of the Himalayas down into Western China and thence by a transmarine migration, which touched some islands and missed out others, across the Malay Archipelago as far as New Zealand!

More recent work upon Palestinian and Canaanite religion is not only leading us to revise our judgments upon the formerly alleged uniqueness of some features in Hebrew ceremonial and theology, but is also throwing into even stronger relief the greatness of the work accomplished by the Hebrew prophets, the sublimity of their message, and its discontinuity from what preceded it. Yet we have still to assess the contribution of Proto-Nordic Aryans such as the Mitanni to the development of ethical monotheism.

Once again, our present consideration of intercultural contacts and of the manner in which they are actually operating before our eyes is leading to increased concentration upon the phenomenon of theism in early medieval India. It may, of course, be an independent development, but it is certainly remarkable that the theistic movement initiated by the Alvars and continued by Ramanuja and Ramananda originated in just that part of India where early Christian missions had gained some foothold.* Premature inferences must in the interests of scientific accuracy be avoided at all cost; but the situation demands close and unprejudiced study. In any case people who still think of the Indian as either a *déraciné* atheist, a pantheistic monist, or a gross polytheist should realize that a sort of evangelical theism is still the working faith of vast multitudes in Hindustan, and has been so for some centuries.

Dr. L. E. Browne is helping us to elucidate the strength and affinities of Christian Fundamentalism and orthodox Islam by pointing out that both ultimately depend upon the dogma that God is an arbitrary Being, Who expresses His Almightiness by flouting our reason and ignoring our sense of justice. "God (in both cases) is not to be enquired as to what He does."

The connexion between the study of the history of religions and the science of psychology is also receiving increasing recognition, since the analysis of the nature of prophetic experience bears strongly upon the veridical nature (or otherwise) of the visions (or visualizations) and auditions which the prophets assert that they have had. Girgensohn,† in his great experimental work claims to have established that Hume and Feuerbach and their successors up to the present day are all definitely mistaken in resolving religious experience without remainder into the bodily reactions of desire and aversion

* *Cf. The Hindu Doctrine of the Deity* by Bharatan Kumarappa, Univ. of London, 1933.

† Published in 1921 and issued in a greatly enlarged edition in 1930 after his untimely death by his collaborator, Dr. Werner Grühn, and entitled *Der seelische Aufbau des religiösen Erlebens, Eine religions psychologische Untersuchung auf experimenteller Grundlage.*

(Lust und Unlust). These, he says, cannot adequately account for its psychic element. It is impossible to separate the reactions from the Numinous Cause which evokes them.

Lastly, we are learning, I think, to study religions as dynamic rather than as static phenomena, as *events* rather than as *things*. Thus it is inept to speak of "the religion of Egypt" without qualification. Egyptian religion endured for so many millennia that Christianity compared therewith is but a mushroom growth; and yet it eventually perished, leaving behind much by way of temples and *objets d'art*. Clearly, length of tenure cannot by itself establish the truth of any system. "The faith of the ages" may merely be something very old and well adapted to the convenience of contemporary humanity. Yet even the religion of the Egyptians passed through many phases and included within its hospitable borders many different types. It rose in one swoop to Atenism, mainly as the work of one man, and then rapidly declined again, until by the time of Juvenal it had degenerated so as to be a byword for its theriolatry. Hinduism is the greatest *complexio oppositorum* in the world. If we are to believe Heiler, even modern Romanism combines seven quite different types of religion. The alleged uniformity and immobility of *semper eadem* are little more than a gigantic illusion. The religious life of most of humanity is in constant oscillation, and its members tend to feel that one phase in this instability is as good as another. Hence Chinese and Indians alike do not regard it as inconsistent to include Christ in a pantheon which permits gods many and lords many to be worshipped, or even to subordinate Him to an Impersonal Absolute. The intransigeant exclusiveness of Jews and Christians introduces a different element into religion, and tends to stabilize it, though in a full Catholicism the oscillation is retained within this exclusiveness. Mankind changes its habits with surprising rapidity, and conceals real changes and fluctuations of belief beneath a veneer of cultus, the meaning and significance of which may have completely altered with the passage of time. Lord Melbourne would, one supposes, hardly recognize the Church of England of today as the same body that it was in 1837.

We need always remember the comparative infancy of our study, and the probability that, although the golden creative age of religion may have passed for ever, the assimilation of the rich and varied inheritance with which Providence has endowed us has hardly yet reached the stage when it can properly benefit a race which is at the moment passing painfully from one organization of society to another.

The Christianity of the future, which may easily have (are we not told ?) 150,000 million or alternatively a million million years to run, will doubtless retain its continuant element, but may well be simplified and expressed anew, after a temporary shrinkage, so as to be the common world-religion of a world-federation of Soviet republics, with a post-surrealist art, and an applied science providing unprecedented leisure for millions of well-spaced and well-nourished human individuals, whose social stability enables them to look back with ever-renewed thankfulness for their present blessings to the dim and distant past, when mankind worked for private profit, and a minority of states could indulge in burglary, in spite of the desire of the rest of the world to live at peace !

Meanwhile it has become clear that the specifically Christian doctrine of revelation, whatever its credibility, differs from other doctrines which bear the same name in one vital respect. It is not simply another title for discovery, although no revelation is of any avail till it has been apprehended. It is not simply illumination, " God causing Himself to be understood " by a mental process in the believer, although the fact of revelation is useless without the illumination which makes it an effective power in life. It is not even a series of recurrent interventions, discontinuities, or intensifications, which may well be repeated over and over again. It is something which (it is true) may be a special case of the latter, but which is nevertheless unrepeatable and to that extent *sui generis*—a Divine Initiative related to all other instances of Divine Activity just as the one great central revealing act of a man's life is related to all his other actions, whether they be unusual or habitual.

A. C. Bouquet.

A PASSION PLAY IN THE AUSTRIAN TYROL

Oberammergau, with its *Passionspiele*, is a household word throughout both Europe and the United States. Even the American lady who was overheard on a June evening in 1910 to confess that she did not know what the play was about, but she thought it was the story of a man who was betrayed by his friend, had contracted with her travel-agent for a ticket and was already on the spot. But not everybody knows that in certain regions of the Austrian Tyrol there have been Passion Plays for centuries. They are still given, and, in one village

at least, in a modern form. Poor Austria has lost her political greatness, and with the disappearance of much that never was her own there has also passed from her some of that which seemed, at least to the foreign visitor, to be bone of her bone; but she has kept her charm, her Catholic piety and her artistic sense. She has also acquired a new psychology. To all these, even the last of them—for what is any new psychology but another way of interpreting the recurrent phenomena of permanent humanity?—Thiersee is indebted for the modern form of its traditional Passion Play.

Thiersee is a tiny village near Kufsein, where Austria is almost South Bavaria. It has had its own play there since 1801. It was at that time very simple, played in the churchyard, using no words but those of the Bible. In 1875 Josef Manrhofer wrote a prologue and some words to be spoken by a chorus. Music, including some plainsong and a few familiar chorales, came in for the first time in 1896. By 1914 Arch-Abbot Jacobus Reimer, O.S.B., had prepared an entirely new arrangement and text under the title of "Christus." That was the war year, and Reimer's playwas not actually produced until 1921. The new theatre was built in 1926. It has been since then the scene of other plays, some sacred, "In the Sign of the Cross" and *Mysterium Crucis*; some, like "William Tell" and "The Jungfrau of Orleans," of a more secular kind. This year Reimer's "Christus" has been given every Sunday during August and part of September.

Not many English people seem to visit it, but the closely seated theatre, which holds about a thousand, was quite full on the Sunday of our visit. The audience consisted for the most part of country people, with a number of Austrian and German ecclesiastics variously dressed, Sisters of Charity, and a picturesque group of brown-habited monks, with beards, spectacles, umbrellas and little bags containing a midday meal. Of English ecclesiastics there were at least two present, but they were both unrecognizable—unless indeed there is force in what a Hungarian delegate said to the writer at the international Oxford Conference in July: "If I met you in Central Europe in holiday dress, I should know you to be an English clergyman." Anyhow, we all assembled outside the theatre by about 10.30 on Sunday morning. The box-office was rather amateurish. The official was not quite sure which places had been taken and which were still available. But good temper and the desire to please were evident on every side. A swift Mass is said in the theatre at 11, and at 11.25 the play begins. It lasts until about 5.30, with a *Mittagpause* of an hour and a half.

The play is not so ambitious as at Oberammergau, and the music of it is less finished, but it includes more of the Gospel story, and in some respects it is an even better artistic production. It may well be that if the Oberammergauers chose to do what Thiersee does, they would do it supremely well, but it is the fact that in the Thiersee "Christus" the selection and combination of incidents, though a few liberties are taken with history, are the work of a writer with a strong dramatic sense.

Herr Alois Kaindl makes an admirable Christus, not the apocalyptic figure of Dr. Schweitzer, or the transcendent, prophecy-fulfilling portent of Karl Barth or Sir Edwyn Hoskyns, or the revolutionary firebrand of Mr. Conrad Noel, or after the pattern of any modern literary, critical artist, but grave, strong and dignified, Johannine rather than Synoptic. There is also behind the play a philosophical understanding of the cosmic significance of the Gospel. In a way which is at once simple and profound, the play presents the story of the "Three Creations"—the Creation and the Fall of the Angels, the Creation and the Fall of Man, and the Recreation or Redemption of Man. The implications of St. Luke's mysterious addition to the narrative of the Lord's temptation in the Wilderness, "The devil departed from him for a season," are generously drawn out. Satan, played by an accomplished actor in Georg Atzl, is one of the leading characters. After his defiance and his fall, he determines in Miltonic fashion to take vengeance by seducing God's new creation of mankind, and eventually braces himself to try conclusions with the Redeemer. In Eden he is only a heard voice, but from the fourth verse onwards he appears, a dark and dimly seen figure, not only after the baptism in Jordan, but at Gethsemane, where he strides up and down and makes long and taunting speeches; at the point where Pilate begins to weaken, as the darkness falls over Calvary; and during a rather over-long scene while the final triumph of the Resurrection is maturing.

The New Testament part of the play misses a chance by not shewing the Annunciation. It opens with an exquisite tableau of the Nativity, with shepherds and Magi. Dramatic tension begins with the Baptist, who denounces the Jewish leaders as *Vipernbrut*. After the Baptism and Temptation comes a long composite scene, very ingeniously constructed. Students of the Gospels will see how much rearrangement there has been when it is said that a part of the Johannine discourse on the Bread of Life, the ambitious request of the sons of Zebedee, "Render unto Cæsar," "the lilies of the field," "the foxes have holes," "Abraham rejoiced to see My day," the healing of Bartimæus, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, how often

would I have gathered thy children," "Suffer little children to come unto Me," the beatitudes, the confession of Peter, the raising of the widow's son at Nain, and Peter's "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," follow one another in that order in one scene.

It is a bold regrouping of incidents from different places and periods, which would not stand critical examination, but as a building up of what might be called the dramatic thesis of the growing fame of Jesus, to be met presently by the antithesis of Pharisee and Sadducee opposition, it has in it a touch of genius. The antithesis is developed in the next two scenes, in the Temple precincts and in the house of Simon the Pharisee, at somewhat excessive length. There is all through rather too much of the Jewish leaders, and not enough of the Twelve.

As we approach the crisis, there is no washing of the disciples' feet, one of the great scenes at Oberammergau, but the Communion of the Holy Body and the Holy Blood are shewn with moving solemnity in two brief tableaux. The Christus has just begun to minister first the Paten and then the Chalice to the Twelve when the curtain falls. We then have some more of the Johannine discourse and dialogue, the "Master, is it I?" of Judas, another first-rate actor, and some talk with the women and Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa, who have come in since the ending of the Supper, and the scene ends with part of the High Priestly prayer from John xvii.

Gethsemane is admirably staged. The light cast on the Redeemer illuminates and interprets, without seeming what is commonly called theatrical, and the darkness which shrouds the moving, gesticulating figure of Satan is effective. His taunt is: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; you will so fall; you will not save the people." Then comes the arrival of the soldiers, the kiss and the arrest. As all move off, Judas is left soliloquizing. His despair has begun. It is all so different from what he had hoped, from the day when as a young man he first met Jesus. The world is full of false lights and quivering shades. The death-bird shrieks. He must go back to the city. As he goes, borrowing for himself the Johannine touch, "and it was night," Satan enters again and follows him off.

Then we have more of the Sanhedrin, and a long scene before Pilate. Historical probability is stretched when the Jews say bluntly, "We appeal unto Cæsar," and a moment later, "Away with Pilate! To Rome!" an audacity which they would never have dared. When the final choice is offered between Jesus and Barabbas, Nicodemus and Joseph, standing a little apart, raise a faint cry of "Jesus of Nazareth"; but

their voices are drowned in the general shout, and when the verdict is given at last, the threats of the Jews are turned into "Hail, righteous judge! Hail, Pilate, the invincible!" Led by Caiaphas, the people call down the blood of this Man upon themselves and their children, and the Pharisees cry: "Blessed be Jehovah, who has this day delivered His people from the hand of the corrupters." The scene then passes to the *Via Crucis*, which is very pitiful. As in the Johannine version, there is no Simon of Cyrene, but Veronica does her deed of charity, and holds up to the audience the handkerchief with the Holy Face. The Jews here are very savage, and dramatic contrast is purchased at some cost of truth.

At the Crucifixion itself the illusion is remarkable. The robbers hang with their arms over the cross, but the Christus is to all appearances nailed fast to the wood, with no apparent support. The Seven Words are all spoken, and the scene lasts about fifteen minutes. The Descent, though it lacks the slow-moving tenderness of the Oberammergau version, is full of pathos. But before that the moral has been pointed in a way that goes far beyond the much more convincing reserve of the Gospel narrative. As the darkness deepens and the Crucified Figure bows His head and dies, Satan's cry of "Mine is the kingdom" is countered by the Voice of God, "I AM; HE is," and the people moralize:

> No man has so died!
> Have mercy, Lord,
> We have sinned. Forgive!

The Centurion gives his testimony, and the people cry again:

> He was the Holy One of the Lord,
> The King of Israel!
> Son of God, have mercy upon us.

All this is the language of Catholic piety rather than of history, and the presentation of the Resurrection is marred by the same well-meaning non-realism. Why is it that man will choose to trust his own sentiment rather than to receive what God has done? The Gospel story is at hand. The appearance to Mary Magdalene is full of dramatic possibility. Or the Emmaus incident, treated, for example, as Mr. Monnington has treated it in the altar-picture that he has painted for Bolton Parish Church, would have made a superb scene. We long for something like G. K. Chesterton's picture of the Being whom he calls Sunday, "like some great Archangel, judging justly after heroic wars, truth in the eyes, and honour and sorrow in the mouth." Instead of either realism or the true idealism, we have a long conversation between a shepherd, who is expecting victory, and the soldiers on guard at the

Sepulchre, with Satan, who still believes that he has triumphed, interjecting occasional ejaculations. Then there are thunder and lightning. Satan perceives that the Crucified is come to be his judge. He sinks down. The shepherd cries:

> Thou comest, Lord, in smoke and fire !
> King of Eternity ! Alleluia !

The Christus rises and stands above the tomb. This is followed by a sentimental tableau, with angels and children, in which there is no strength, but only prettiness.

So the play ends. There is another scene in the book in which Death appears and dies. There is also in it a dialogue of Michael and Satan, with some echoes from Matt. xxv.; the voices of the ungodly are heard, saying, "Lord, when saw we Thee an hungred and gave Thee no meat ?" They are sent into eternal fire, and sink in despair out of sight. The righteous are called into the Kingdom. Satan at last acknowledges defeat: "Curses on me ! The battle is lost !"

The play is better without this. All the interpretation that is needed is given by the conscience of the spectator, and by the admirable chorus of twenty men and twenty women, who enter from two sides between the scenes. The leader, Oberlehrer Rieser, speaks his lines with grave solemnity, and the choric odes seem to be just what such odes should be, interpreting comments which illuminate but do not overstrain the comprehension of the audience. To witness the play even once is a notable experience. It need not be said that it owes its appeal in the first place to its sublime subject, the central tragedy of human history; but it has behind it as well centuries of simple piety, and one who for all his occasional lapses into sentimentality, like those which sometimes impair the architectural severity of the continental churches, deserves to be ranked among the masters of dramatic art.

S. C. Carpenter.

THE COUNTRY CLERGY OF THE RESTORATION PERIOD

There have been not a few references of late to the famous third chapter of Macaulay's *History*, that which displays the state of England in 1685. Perhaps G. M. Trevelyan's chapters in *Blenheim* on the England of Queen Anne have sent many to read again his kinsman's more lively but less accurate

account of the period which preceded it. It deserves remembrance, even though it is marked by grave faults, notably by Macaulay's failure to allow for the great change in the value of money between the age of the Restoration and his own time.

But no student of history needs to be reminded that Macaulay could never curb the expression of his own vehement prejudices. His pontifical air and charm of style combine to persuade many of his readers to share them. In particular, when the Church was concerned he scarcely pretended to be impartial. It may be useful, therefore, to examine again the historical value of those pages in the third chapter which he devotes to the country clergy of the Restoration period.

Macaulay's main contention is that the clergy of the Restoration period were divided into two sharply contrasted sections. The one class consisted of able, learned, well-born men, whose address and knowledge of the world enabled them to meet on equal terms the leaders of English society. "These eminent men were to be found, with scarcely a single exception, at the Universities, at the great cathedrals, or in the capital." The other class, of the provincial and rural clergy, consisted of ignorant plebeians, of whom some toiled on their scanty glebes, living in grinding poverty, grateful for the chance of a meal in the kitchen of the great house, while others were hardly more than menial servants in the houses of the squires. Yet even of these poor creatures Macaulay affirms that they held high the dignity of that sacerdotal office which was their sole title to reverence, and that they had a great influence over the clowns who came to the parish church. They were not, then, wholly negligible; to the poor the Gospel was preached.

The wives of the rural clergymen were even less estimable than their husbands; after the Restoration "a waiting-woman was generally considered as the most suitable helpmate for a parson." In support of this statement Macaulay affirms that Elizabeth, "as head of the Church, had given what seemed to be a formal sanction to this prejudice by issuing special orders that no clergyman should presume to marry a servant-girl without the consent of the master or mistress." But a reference to Elizabeth's Injunction entirely disposes of the contention that the order was in any sense special; it enjoined that no priest or deacon should marry "any manner of woman" without sanction of the bishop and the two nearest justices, and the goodwill of her parents and friends, or of her master and mistress. So far from being a special and formal sanction of clerical marriage with serving-maids, the Injunction covered every kind of clerical marriage. Macaulay made a most

unscrupulous use of his document. Nor in any case could we regard an Elizabethan Injunction (which, as Heylin says, fell dead from the first, and was only intended to be cautionary) as valid evidence to the custom of a century later. Swift also is called as a witness; he had observed that in a great household the chaplain was the resource of a lady's maid whose character had been blown upon, and who was therefore forced to give up hopes of catching the steward. Apart from the fact that Swift did not leave Ireland for England until after the close of Macaulay's period, and that his censure would therefore have applied, if at all, to the Church of the Revolution, it may be observed that Swift had few opportunities of knowing England beyond the neighbourhood of Moor Park and London; and that the "Directions to Servants" were written in 1738, when the shadows of insanity were falling upon a man whose contempt for his fellows had throughout life embittered his judgements, and who had always had an insane delight in malodorous references. Macaulay might be ready to accept Swift's evidence against the country clergy and to pay him a graceful compliment. Yet some readers of the *History* would not have forgotten that a few years before, in the *Edinburgh Review*, Macaulay had denounced Swift as "the apostate politician, the ribald priest, the perjured lover, a heart burning with hatred against the whole human race, a mind richly stored with images from the dunghill and the lazar-house."

Macaulay presented to his readers a specious half-truth, a generalization from insufficient data. The satirists on whom he relied could point to some country priests and their unbecoming marriages in justification of their contempt. But there were many others of an altogether different quality. Of them Macaulay makes no mention; he was perhaps unaware of their existence, though it needed no prolonged research to discover them. In any age it will be found that a high proportion of the learned among the clergy are attracted or assigned to those centres in which Macaulay placed them "with scarcely a single exception." But it is entirely untrue that the provincial clergy of the Restoration period were almost to a man low-born, ignorant and uncouth. It need not be denied that some were of the kind which Macaulay describes; his documentary evidence may be allowed to establish so much, even if most of it is drawn from definitely unfriendly sources. It would have been strange indeed if among all the rural clergy some were not found to be unworthy of their office. The Church of the Restoration had emerged from twenty years of unremitting persecution, and had suffered heavy losses.

The Laudian clergy had been evicted, despoiled, harried even to their deaths. The worship of the Church had been proscribed. Ordinations had been held in secret, as by Bishop Skinner at Oxford; and those who sought ordination in the dark days when—in John Evelyn's phrase—the Church was in dens and caves of the earth, when to ordain or to be ordained was a penal offence, shewed themselves to be men of high courage and real vocation. But secret ordinations were quite insufficient to fill the places of those who died. After the Puritan persecution, as after the Black Death, the immediate and pressing needs of the Church had to be met by the ordination of some who did not reach her normal standards. And before the clergy as a whole there lay at the Restoration an overwhelming task. Old habits of devotion had been broken, old traditions of worship lost, old beliefs shaken. A whole generation had grown up uninstructed in the faith of its fathers, unfamiliar with liturgical worship. Of these extenuating circumstances Macaulay takes no account; he demands uniform excellence in a Church which Puritanism had all but destroyed.

But although the Church in the countryside had suffered heavily it can yet be shewn that the clergy of the villages and smaller towns included many men of learning and good breeding, so many that Macaulay's universal censure appears as a falsification of history. His own "sixth form boy" would have avoided Macaulay's initial blunder. Having divided the English clergy into Athenian and Bœotian, cultivated and rustic, he took it for granted that each class kept strictly within its own territory of town or country. In fact, there was a constant interchange between the urban and the rural clergy, as there is to-day and as there has always been. Many of the scholarly clergy passed from the universities and the towns to country parishes, some to stay, some to return after a time to important office. Among the country parsons of England there have always been found cultivated men; neither at the Restoration nor in any age could it truthfully be said the the country clergy with scarcely a single exception were unlettered boors. One who had been a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, should have remembered that the universities and colleges hold a very large number of advowsons—at the present day between eight and nine hundred, and in the Restoration age most of their benefices were rural. To college livings Fellows and scholars had the first claim; men of some birth and education were as a consequence the incumbents of many rural parishes. It might be argued that these men did not effectively serve their cures, but rode out for Sunday duty from the towns in which they lived, or set ill-paid curates to

reside in their stead. But the evils of plurality and non-residence were in the main the growth of a later day, and were far less prevalent before the Revolution than after it. Nor can the effect of private patronage be disregarded. All over the country family livings provided suitable maintenance for the younger sons of the squires, tenants of the comfortable rectories and vicarages of the Restoration period which still survive in some number.

We need not look far in any county for some refutation of Macaulay's disparagement of the country parsons. In 1682 John Kettlewell, Fellow of Lincoln College, in whose frail body the spirit of George Herbert seemed to live again, left Oxford to become vicar of the little country town of Coleshill, and to shew himself a parish priest of exemplary devotion. He married no mere waiting-maid of his noble patron, but the daughter of a Berkshire county family. Kettlewell found a congenial neighbour in Dr. Thomas Bray, then chaplain in a squire's household, and therefore of the class of "young Levites" upon whom Macaulay pours contempt. Dr. Bray was a founder of the S.P.G. and S.P.C.K., and of the libraries which bear his name; it is the judgement of a professed historian that to no one in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries does the practical work of the English Church owe a greater debt. As the vicar of two parishes which then were rural, Dr. William Cave wrote those twelve volumes on the Fathers and the early Church which for more than a century remained standard works. As a child he had shared that harsh eviction from a Leicestershire rectory which caused his father's death, and his father was related to very notable Leicestershire families.

It was at a rather later date—but Macaulay is far from observing his own limits of date—that Joseph Bingham wrote in a Hampshire country parish that great work on Christian antiquities which remains of permanent value for its exact scholarship and immense erudition, and he was an excellent parish priest. The Restoration vicar of little Cranbrook in Kent was John Johnson, theologian and student of liturgies, whose writings are still cited in evidence of the eucharistic beliefs of his time, and who wrote for his brother-priests a serviceable "Vade Mecum." After the Restoration the learned Herbert Thorndike went back to the quiet Hertfordshire rectory from which the Puritans had thrust him out. Eyam in the Derbyshire Peak reveres the heroism of its cultivated rector, William Mompesson, when the village was plague-stricken in 1666; he came of a Norman stock long settled in Wiltshire, his wife was the daughter of a Durham squire. Thomas Wilson, the venerated Bishop of Man, owed much to his early years as

curate to his uncle Richard Sherlock, one of the best parish priests in the North in the reign of Charles II. And those here named are but representative of a large number of Restoration parish priests distributed throughout England.

We have also indirect evidence to their work; they were not always nailing up the squire's apricots, currying his horses, casting up the farrier's bills, smoking and drinking with the grooms. Immediately after the Restoration the bishops of such rural dioceses as Lincoln, Petersborough and St. David's were enquiring whether the daily morning and evening prayer was said in full and without alteration in every church; they spoke of a daily obligation, and enquired only how it was discharged. The archdeacons of Durham and Northumberland were especially insistent that service should be said by all the clergy daily throughout the year. The Bishop of Ely pressed upon the laity the duty of a daily attendance. Archbishop Sancroft issued to his whole province an "Instruction to the Clergy of the Church of England," enjoining all to "perform the Daily Office publickly (with all Decency, Affection and Gravity) in all Market and other Great Towns, and even in Villages and less populous places, bring people to Publick Prayers as frequently as may be." Sancroft also required that his comprovincials should see that none were ordained without "some degree of school," and that letters testimonial for candidates should not be signed as a formality, but by those who had a personal acquaintance with the candidates and could vouch for their fitness.

Other indirect evidence to the character of many of the country clergy may be found in churches that were built, repaired or furnished anew during the Restoration period. They witness not only to the generosity of the laity, but also to the use made of them by the clergy; without that, any such expenditure would have been idle. It is not to be supposed that Thomas Ken, afterwards Bishop of Bath and Wells, was altogether singular when he ministered daily in the church of Little Easton, Essex, his first cure of souls. And the many books of devotion then compiled and printed, even to the number of thirty or forty editions, were not used only by Londoners, but were distributed to their parishioners by some of the country clergy, as by John Kettlewell at Coleshill.

Enough has been said to disprove Macaulay's accusation against the whole body of the country clergy. That many were unequal to their opportunities need not be denied; at least we shall not follow the historian in sneering at their poverty. Macaulay's offence, unpardonable in a professed historian, lies in his statement that practically no learned and

competent ministers were to be found scattered among the rural population. He was content to take for his sole evidence the ill-natured satire of the age; he can have made no close enquiry into the facts upon which he might have based a balanced and more generous judgement.

E. Hermitage Day.

MISCELLANEA

WHITHER REUNION?

That Christendom should be united is conceded by every true disciple of Christ. The lines of approach to this ideal—nay, to this pregnant necessity—are not so readily agreed upon by all.

The primitive and uncatholic method, adopted by several small Protestant sects and the Church of Rome, is to welcome reunion, provided it means, in the case of the Protestant sects, that thereafter the rest of Christendom will think and act exactly like them, and, in the case of the Church of Rome, that thereafter it will think and act for the rest of Christendom.

Within the more catholic tradition of Christianity, however, there has long been a more constructive aim. Churches have been grateful for any movement, however modest, and in whatever direction, which has tended in some way towards reunion. To many sincere people it does not seem to matter whether reunion is to make Christianity more High Church or more Low Church, more Hellenistic or more Hebraistic, so long as more unity is attained. Such a reunion, however, would be shallow. Tolerance must not be confused with indifference. Better be intolerant than indifferent, but better still be tolerant.

Admirable as are achievements such as the magnificent Scottish accomplishment of 1929, and the Methodist fusion, and welcome as would be more events of this calibre, reunion, to be universally and permanently effective, must go even further. For, as a general principle, the haphazard searching for separated brethren who might merge with us is fraught with some degree of danger, in that, by drawing together small islands in the Christian landscape, it may but enlarge the gulfs between new and larger ones. Instead of dragging the islands together, we must build bridges—not makeshift devices, but a great, systematic scheme for inter-insular traffic. And to do this is both easier and more conducive to the amenity of the landscape of Christendom.

We have to deal with people who think ministers need not be educated, and therefore need not be paid. We have to deal with people who press for even greater scholarship. Some cry for more negro spirituals within the Church, while others yearn for more Gregorian chants. In the Reunion of Christendom we must correlate the Salvation Army with the Greek Orthodox Church. The only body of any numerical importance which we cannot and need not encounter in our scheme is the Church of Rome, which does not, and by its constitution cannot, logically have any understanding with non-Roman Christendom, all of which, from Anglo-Catholicism to the Plymouth Brethren, it officially regards as of the devil, heretical, and subversive of the reign of Christ. It talks, and ever must talk, of a reigning pope, and prays, as it ever must pray, for the conversion of the King.

The Church of the future must be powerful. It must be catholic. It must be free. To be powerful, it must have some degree of national support. To be catholic, it must be international in sympathy and in fact. To be free, it must be capable of absorbing within itself all shades of religious thought and degrees of development.

As a first move, it might seem a natural step to have a solid union between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland. Both are national Churches, established by law. Both strive after a scholarly ministry. Differences in ritual do not now mean what they did yesterday, and differences in ecclesiastical government might be gracefully united in one system. The result would be a very powerful Church. But would it be catholic? And would it be free? Both the existing Churches might lose in catholicism and freedom.

The alternative is for each national Church to set its house more fully in order. It must become more truly national, by becoming more graceful in syncretism. To do this, the Churches need not sacrifice half so much as has been done by the magnanimity of parties to reunions of the past. But it is necessary that the Churches, and all who love the name of Jesus, shake hands, and sit down to make a concordat—not to bear with one another, but to unite in mutually enthusiastic admiration, in the name of Christ and Christendom, powerful, catholic and free.

Nor is this an impracticable dream. For simplicity, postulate the ardent desire for union, on the part of:

The Church of England,
The Church of Scotland,
The Scottish Episcopal Church,
The Presbyterian Church in England,
The Congregational Union of England,
The Congregational Union of Scotland,
The Salvation Army.

Autonomy would have to be wholeheartedly accorded to each of these bodies, but they would be none the less unified because of that. The leading idea would be something of an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*, to use the phrase of Zinzendorf, who, though a pietist, had spiritual depth enough to have kindly feelings towards the Lutheran State Church, and that even in the eighteenth century. It is true that his plans at first served only to separate further the Moravians from the German State Church, but Zinzendorf did not give up the idea, and in 1749 the Moravian body, with its particular kind of liturgical beauty, accepted the Augsburg Confession, and was recognized as part of the Saxon State Church. Within the Church of Rome, trammelled as it is by a hidebound faith and theology, there is an excellent variety, in the externals of Liturgy and government, between the numerous Eastern rites and the Latin Rite, and between the old monastic orders and the less ancient congregations of persons bound by religious vows. Married priests, baptism by immersion, communion under both kinds (*i.e.*, bread and wine), democratic voting for executive positions and other things seemingly exotic to Rome all find their place in the Roman system.

The position, then, after reunion would be something like this:

Church of England.	*Church of Scotland.*
National Rite.	National Rite.
English Presbyterian Rite.	Scottish Episcopal Rite.
English Congregational Rite.	Scottish Congregational Rite.
Order of the Salvation Army in England.	Order of the Salvation Army in Scotland.

These rites, or *ecclesiolæ in ecclesia*, would have absolutely independent government and would be subject to no interference from the National Rite, which likewise would retain all its ancient privileges. Thus, churches of the Scottish Congregational Rite would continue to elect ministers according to their present system, but it would be hoped in the long run to have a minimum standard of general and theological education for the ministers of all rites, beyond which minimum standard each individual rite would be free to establish a higher minimum of its own. Orders of persons set aside for special works, such as the Salvation Army, or a particular prayer ideal, such as the Society of Friends, would have, as at present, no ministry in the sense of men of letters trained in systematic theology and exegesis of the Greek and Hebrew text. But, although in these orders there would be no minimum standard of education or scholarship on the part of the leaders, there would be arranged minimum standards of spiritual training, as is done at present, for example, by the Salvation Army in the case of its officers. Later it might even be hoped that the orders would agree on a general minimum standard in the matter of the term of spiritual discipline and training, so that all the piously and evangelically minded people who were members of these orders and societies would recognize in one another different methods of attaining one ideal.

An appeal, not in the name of England, but in the name of Jesus Christ, would be launched to all Englishmen, to unite in the scheme of organized tolerance. If it is asked why the scheme should be thus national in basis, the answer is that a territorial basis is not merely natural, but the surest safeguard that the union of organized tolerance is genuine, and not merely a sympathetic clique of Churches likely to oppose some other sympathetic clique of the future.

The appeal would be not a Christian appeal in the name of the nation, but a national appeal in the name of Christ, and any dissenting bodies who refused to answer it would not thereby be deprived of possible future recognition as rites or orders of the Christian Church in England, or Scotland, or wherever it might be. It would be ordained that, whereas for the future bodies which desired to be separately autonomous within the Church would have to justify the rite-distinction they claimed, by reason of numerical or other importance, retrospectively, on the other hand, there would be complete autonomy for every constituted body, however small and seemingly unimportant, instituted prior to the union, but which did not respond to it at the time.

The National Church would have, in addition to the governing body of the National Rite (*e.g.*, in the case of the Church of Scotland, the General Assembly), a further tribunal to act as a Court of Appeal to which all rites other than the National Rite might appeal from the decisions of their governing bodies (in extreme cases). This tribunal would consist of the governing body of the National Rite supplemented by representatives of all the other rites and orders. There would be vested in this court powers of arbitration, but no legislative powers which could interfere with the autonomy of each rite. The resolutions of this body, however, would have overwhelming sway on the actions of the secular authorities, who, in this country at any rate, are normally extraordinarily well disposed to the Christian dictates of the nation, whenever they can be certain what they really are.

National reunions accomplished on lines such as these would make

the final international reunion almost a natural consequence. True pacifists are not over-optimistic about the peace of a sub-Christian world, but the influence of truly organized, truly tolerant, truly national Churches on the states of the world would be indeed formidable. These Churches could unite in a League of Churches which would have arbitration powers towards the national Churches in this League corresponding exactly to the powers of the national tribunals towards their respective rites and orders. Likewise, the resolutions of the League of Churches would have overwhelming sway on the trend of international affairs, and a spiritual base for the League of Nations.

The ecclesiastical institution of Rome would be outside this League, it is true, and, by reason of its military constitution and militant methods, would be to Catholic Christendom very much what Germany is to peace-loving Europe to-day. And, as in the case of Germany, the *raison d'être* of its militarism would be its reactionary fear of a great evil. For, as Germany not without reason feared the greater evil of a bestial Bolshevism grunting its hymn of hate of spiritual activity and God, and conquered that menace by its own crude methods, so Rome is military because of its fear of materialism coupled with inadequate faith in Christ and His power. Like the apostle whom it lauds and acclaims so highly, it wants to be spiritual and walk on the sea, but very soon it sinks, because it has not faith enough otherwise to do.

There is nothing in the world, however, which Rome of to-day fears so much as a scheme such as that here proposed. An army of machine guns besieging the Vatican City would not so disconcert her, nor would the bitter enmity of all the non-Romanistic world. Men fear things they cannot understand, and it is not therefore unnatural that Rome should so dread organized tolerance, which belongs to the New Age, and which has transcended her, and left her behind with Israel and a stiff-necked past.

"For the body is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were the hearing, where were the smelling? But now God hath set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased Him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now there are many members, yet but one body. And the eye cannot say unto the hand, I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body which seem to be more feeble, are necessary: and those members of the body which we think to be less honourable, upon those we bestow more abundant honour; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness" (1 Cor. xii. 15-23).

GEDDES MACGREGOR.

A REFORMATION PORTRAIT GALLERY

A BOOK by Mr. Hilaire Belloc on the Reformation period—its philosophy and history—is bound to be something of a re-hash; and it would be absurd to deny that some of the old prejudices, enthusiasms, capricious

judgments and special pleadings are repeated in his latest volume, *Characters of the Reformation*. Cranmer is still a sinister time-server, Oliver Cromwell the grim spectre of Manichæanism, Richelieu the ultimate spoiler of Catholicism in France; and Cecil, of course, the villain of the piece as far as Elizabethan England is concerned. Mary Stuart smiles as fairly as ever out of the rather tired pages which describe the vivid and tragic part she played in the drama, while William of Orange (by which Mr. Belloc means the lesser William of Orange) is still the rather detestable and morose adulterer whom the author loves to pillory as England's special choice! Nevertheless, the hash is not without its succulence; and, if there is little originality in the book for those who have grown familiar with Mr. Belloc's views on the Reformation, he has at least developed these characters, or some of them, and there are in it some flashes of brilliant insight into the neglected corners of history. He says, for instance:

" But Gardiner is the true Englishman of the time in body and mind and everything else. And that is his importance; understanding him, you understand the English Reformation, or rather you understand the kind of average citizen upon whom the catastrophe fell. It is therefore a great loss to history that even highly educated men have heard so little of him. For a hundred men who have heard of Henry, for fifty who have heard of Cranmer, perhaps one could tell you who Stephen Gardiner was."*

That is at least original and well worth pondering, and what Mr. Belloc has to say about the middle classes, law, education, and business of daily living is often of the same illuminating kind; but ever and anon it seems that he *must* return to his baleful prejudices. So we hear again that " Anne Boleyn was the first figure of the English Reformation " and that " it was because she was what she was, and did what she did, that England is what England is today." To ascribe the modern imbroglio in which we find ourselves today to the " little wanton " is going rather far—even for Mr. Belloc's magnificent special pleading; and his theory that the wealthy landlords of the spoiled monasteries have kept the power of the Pope at bay for purely material reasons is obviously refuted by the Marian reaction—after which the Papal power and the restoration of monastic lands could never have been regarded as a single cause.

There is ample justification for his enthusiasm over the Jesuit martyrs and his indignation at the network of treachery, foul lying and forgery, that brought Mary Stuart to the block; but it is not true that " the religious passions which centre round (*sic*) her name " obscure the issue for anyone who is clear-headed enough to see that a martyr may die gloriously in a wrong cause. It is this perpetual confusion between historical facts and religious convictions (that seems to be growing upon Mr. Belloc) that makes each chapter in his book bristle with provocative statements, and makes the whole thing quite absurdly partisan. He even breaks fresh ground with it—stretching the Reformation to involve in its network the controversy between the Jesuits and the *Provinciales* of Pascal. Here his lack of adequate philosophical equipment lets him down rather badly; and some will feel an eyebrow go up over the assertion that Pascal causes " a sort of cloud over the mind in which men lose the Faith." Nevertheless, Mr. Belloc gives a very able exposition of the

* Mr. C. E. Douglas writes in *Constitutional Episcopacy* (p. 20): "It would be difficult to find a more typical Anglican . . . than Stephen Gardiner."

plain man's reaction to the little philosophical controversy into which Europe broke out at a later age when he says:

"Your plain man, who is made in the image of God, and who, so long as his reason and conscience are not warped, is on the right lines, has no patience with any denial of it. The whole human society takes it for granted. The witness in a Court of Justice, the man conducting his own affairs, the simplest activities of daily life, takes for granted as absolutely certain, not only the external universe in which we live, but our own power of apprehending it. Descartes returned to the very extreme of the old Greek scepticism."

This is all perfectly true; but, in view of the fact that it is hardly the province of the historian, one is the more surprised that Mr. Belloc goes so far out of his province in search of it. For the Reformation was concerned with concrete matters of Church and State. The creeds were maintained by the Protestants as stoutly as they were by the Catholics, and such problems as the nature of the perception were of later development. Perhaps the author was growing rather tired of the old ground which he has traversed so often—or feared that we should no longer relish viands that have been hashed too often for our appetites! It may confidently be said that this book throws no new light upon the great subject of which it treats; but it is a useful guide to Mr. Belloc's views upon a well-worn theme—though the rather startling portraits at the end might well have been replaced by an index for the purpose.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

REVIEWS

POLYCARP'S TWO EPISTLES TO THE PHILIPPIANS. By P. N. Harrison, M.A., D.D. Pp. xii+356. Cambridge University Press, 1936. 21s. net.

The thesis of Dr. Harrison's new book is that the letter commonly known as "The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians" really consists of two letters: "The first, consisting of our thirteenth chapter, possibly also the fourteenth, was a short covering note sent by the Bishop of Smyrna, who was then in his forties, along with a batch of Ignatian Epistles, directly after the visits paid by Ignatius as a prisoner to Smyrna and Philippi on his way to Rome. It was dispatched probably within a fortnight of Ignatius' departure from Philippi, and before he and his company could have arrived at the end of their journey. Polycarp assumes (1) that they are still alive, and (2) that before long definite information as to their fate will have reached Philippi. . . ." "The second Epistle, consisting of our first twelve chapters, was written after the name of Ignatius had become a blessed memory, and the story of his martyrdom had passed into history, and the remembrance of that visit to Philippi had become a proud and treasured possession there, to which, in a dark hour of crisis, Polycarp could appeal, and be sure that, so far at least as the best and most responsible elements in that Church were concerned, he would not appeal in vain. . . ." "As to how, when, and why the fusion of these two letters took place, the present suggestion is that, quite soon after the death of Polycarp (A.D. 155-6), there must have been a demand for copies of those Epistles which the blessed martyr and spiritual *princeps Asiae* was known to have written to Churches within his wide sphere of influence. What had proved so helpful in steadying the particular community to which it was first addressed would thus serve the same purpose on a larger scale."

It is probable that anyone who having read so far takes a plain text of the Epistle, if possible one in which the problem is not complicated by inclusion of any attempted reconstruction in Greek of passages that survive only in Latin, and reads chapters 13 and 14 by themselves and then chapters 1-12 by themselves will be more likely to appreciate the difficulty for which Dr. Harrison seeks to provide a solution than if he uses the reconstruction which the author himself provides in his Appendices. It will possibly not greatly trouble such a reader

that in chapter 13 the Latin says "et de ipso Ignatio et de his qui cum eo sunt," since if "et de his qui cum eo sunt" were a translation of "καὶ περὶ τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ" there is no necessary implication that Ignatius was alive when the words were written. But he will find it hard indeed to persuade himself that the language of chapter 9 can on any reasonable method of exegesis be interpreted as allowing that Ignatius and Zosimus and Rufus are still alive, and certainly the first two or three lines of chapter 1 could not be inconsistent with their recent death. Nor will the suggestion that Polycarp feels justified in assuming that the martyrdom has taken place because such a consequence was inevitable in such a case be likely to be very readily accepted. Yet all this is very awkward for various classes of critics, and certainly not least for those who wish or feel constrained to find in the "first-born of Satan" referred to in chapter 7 an allusion to Marcion, to whom, according to Irenæus, Polycarp certainly applied this title. It is true that the characteristics of the "first-born of Satan" in this connexion are described as "perverting the Logia of the Lord to his own desires and saying that there is neither resurrection nor judgment" and that the applicability of such language to Marcion's teaching has to be argued, and when argued can scarcely be said to remove all doubts any more than might be the case if it were argued in relation to a follower of Cerinthus, "the enemy of the truth." But there is another consideration. The reader who follows the hint will almost certainly find himself playing with other reconstructions. He will be struck, perhaps, by the reference to the chains in chapter 1 as diadems, and may recall that Ignatius in writing to the Ephesians called them "margaritai"; but they will hardly suggest to him the "diadems" of Rev. xix. 12, and such language may well seem forced in regard to men who have already become worthy of a crown not of man's making. Should we not then join chapter 1 with chapter 13 (and possibly 14)? But if so why not also chapter 2, and do not chapters 3-12 make quite a good separate letter when 1, 2, 13, 14 have been taken away? And is there not a dramatic unity in the way in which the Pauline references are handled? These are rhetorical questions, no doubt, and no more valuable than most devices of the kind, and though the catch-word between chapters 2 and 3 is "righteousness" the Petrine reminiscences of 1, 2 and the citation of our Lord's words at the end of chapter 2 are a curious introduction to the remarkable reference to St. Paul in chapter 3, while 3-12 run reasonably well together. It might also be argued that the interpolation of one letter in the middle of another presents not much greater

difficulty than the supposition that chapter 13 with or without 14 was tacked on to the end of a letter written many years later.

It would be gravely unjust to Dr. Harrison to suggest that he would regard the above presentation of the matter as in the least exhibiting any point of view that he could accept. He is dealing with questions some of which have been debated for centuries, and he gives and discusses the history of each with a wealth of detail as well as of ingenuity to which after reading his book three times the reviewer would desire to offer a tribute of admiration, however much he may be disposed to demur to some of the criticisms of Bishop Lightfoot, some of which are of a more serious kind than the statement that " in dealing with the ministry of women Lightfoot was somewhat at a disadvantage owing to his failure to realize the overwhelming force of the case against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles." That is a subject which no one is likely to discuss in future without taking account of the arguments that Dr. Harrison has adduced on the other side, but " overwhelming " is a strong word, and just because Dr. Harrison would certainly himself demur to the suggestion that it was a disadvantage under which Ignatius and Polycarp also suffered, there are certain aspects of the problem in regard to which either side might easily suspect the other of arguing in a circle. Looking at the matter as a whole, it may be suggested that the most serious difficulty is the reference in chapter 7 to the " first-born of Satan." The title " Prototokos " has a special New Testament association which makes us forget the frequency of its use in the Septuagint. Its correlative is Antichrist, and in the New Testament view there may be many Antichrists, nor is it necessary to suppose that Polycarp never applied the title " first-born of Satan " to anyone save Marcion. And if the reference be to Marcion the reasons for dating *c.* 135 are not coercive—the date might be some years later. Yet it will still remain difficult except as an advocate to make the reference fit, and if the reference be to Marcion, whatever the date selected, it cannot make such language as that of chapter 1 seem even remotely probable. That is of course a matter of personal judgment or even obtuseness, but the reader may be excused for feeling that Dr. Harrison's variation of translation of the aorist in the beginning of the two supposed letters obscures the issue, and in any case that " I rejoice with you greatly in our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye received the copies of the True Love and set forward on their journey, as it behoved you, those men festooned with the hallowed chains, which are diadems of them that have been truly elected by God and our

Lord; and that the stedfast root of your faith, proclaimed from times of old, continueth unto this day," is phraseology almost incredible if the reference is to something which had happened some twenty years before. It would be easier to maintain the integrity of the whole letter than to support the contention that if there are two letters chapter 1 belongs to the later, unless the supposition that chapter 7 refers to Marcion be abandoned. If that were abandoned there might still be two letters, but hardly separated by a long interval of time, and chapter 1 would still be difficult to join with chapter 9.

CLAUDE JENKINS.

REACTIONS IN GERMAN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. Types of Modern Theology. Schleiermacher to Barth. By H. R. Mackintosh. Nisbet. 10s. 6d.

This important contribution to English knowledge of German thought, published since its author's death, might appropriately have been entitled "Modern Reactions in German Theology." It analyzes in succession the theology of feeling, the theology of speculative rationalism, the theology of moral values, the theology of scientific religious history, and the theology of the Word of God.

The exponent of the theology of feeling is of course Schleiermacher, the keynote to his theories being the feeling of unconditional or absolute dependence, without defining any too clearly dependence upon what: a paradoxical insistence on piety without a clear idea of God. He was fully aware of his own pantheistic bias, and judged the concept of personality unfitted to apply to the Divine. The author says that Schleiermacher "accepted the sinless perfection of our Lord, but gave up the idea of His pre-existence as though unconscious of its religious value." There is, however, clear evidence in the German theologian's letters that he was perfectly conscious of its religious value. He wrote: "I cannot believe that He Who called Himself Son of Man was the true eternal God." Years later he wrote his wife complaining that she "adopted a way of speaking constantly of the Saviour, and placing God quite in the background." To which she replied that she "never felt any desire or necessity to keep God our heavenly Father and God our Saviour distinct." The influence of Schleiermacher's subjective religion has been of course immense.

From the theology of feeling, however, there came emphatic reaction to the theology of pure thought. Schleiermacher was opposed by Hegel. The two thinkers were both on the staff of the New University at Berlin. A graphic picture is drawn

of their incompatibility. They "looked upon each other with no little antipathy. Seldom have distinguished thinkers found it harder to appreciate each other's work." To Hegel feeling constituted a lower stage of consciousness, not to be compared with the nobler power of reason. Feeling was semi-animal: reason was grown man's imaginative response to the Universe. A critical appreciation of Hegelianism follows. Great expectations were cherished concerning the benefits that Hegel would confer on the theology of the Church. But the event proved far otherwise. No one, says Mackintosh, has ever been quite sure what Hegel believed about God. His general system is a form of pantheistic Monism. The Infinite or Absolute—which is Hegel's name for God—was said to rise to consciousness of self in the development of the finite mind. Strauss disposed effectively and finally of the hallucination that Christian belief and consistent Hegelianism were two forms of the same thing. Mackintosh reflects that what the Hegelian type of mind lacks in its more characteristic mood is the fear of the Lord. Intellectually it is on much too easy terms with the Divine. Yet "this de-personalized Absolute will no doubt to the end of time present itself as the fitting shadowy correlate of a metaphysical temper that finds it natural either to overlook or to misapprehend the sorest troubles of sinful men."

From the theology of pure thought there came reaction to the theology of moral values. Its representative of course is Albrecht Ritschl, his principal followers being Harnack and Herrmann. Ritschl himself is pictured as "a man of energetic character, masterful, cool, swift and sharp in judgment, much too fond of controversy, but honest and solid, with a strong dislike for sentimentality. Never was there a life more completely absorbed in scientific theology." Ritschl demanded that Metaphysics should be expelled from theology. Yet Mackintosh considers that a somewhat false importance has been ascribed to this professed desire. To Ritschl the subjectivism of Schleiermacher was not less pernicious.

The right starting-point for theology is God's self-attestation in history. This, according to Mackintosh, is the importance of Ritschl. His famous theory of Value-judgments does not deny the objectivity of that which is valued. The judgment that a thing is good presupposes or includes the judgment that the thing is real. Mackintosh agrees with Hermann that Ritschl's denial of the wrath of God was a great sin against the Christian soul, and insists "that to assert unflinchingly that love and holiness are one in God, despite their seeming antagonism, is as much the business of a true theology as to assert that deity and manhood are one in Christ."

Ritschl, says Mackintosh, was a masculine thinker, with the strength but also with the limitations and impatience of his type. His rationalistic moralism and his historical positivism were the main influences by which he was diverted from his course.

We may add Dr. Garvie's estimate that Ritschl "is the founder of a school the members of which, while gratefully acknowledging his influence and loyally accepting his purpose, exercise their liberty and show their independence."

Reaction against the Ritschlian theology of moral values came in the theology of scientific religious history, led by Ernst Troeltsch, the four enormous volumes of whose collected work confront us with their monumental learning. Here was another swing of the pendulum. About 1900 the more radical members of Ritschlianism broke off and set up on their own account. Troeltsch's insistence on relativity, and that facts alleged to be of a supernatural order must be reduced to a scale at which they become amenable to scientific treatment, tended on principle to disparage the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. Christianity was regarded as one religion amongst others.

Mackintosh says that Troeltsch and his adherents get out of history in the way of revelation "just so much as they have resolved beforehand that it can be permitted to contain." The possibilities have been fixed in advance. The facts are compelled to fit the method by which they are to be treated. Mackintosh gives very forcible illustrations of this method.

Troeltsch's most significant essay on the finality of the Christian religion is based on presuppositions which did not allow that any religion, not even Christianity, could be valid universally and for ever. Particular religions could not be regarded as more than individual forms which the spirit of religion may assume. They are peculiar individualizations, irreducible products of the same general principles. It is singular that Mackintosh does not note Von Hügel's surprising endorsement of Troeltsch's matured restatement of this position as being "very true and strong." One would like to have the Scottish thinker's reflections on Hügel's opinion.

Mackintosh's own reply to Troeltsch is that "Christianity stands not for the reaction of man, but for the action of God—for the revelation of God's holy love in Christ, for all that is meant by the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, for the great things which the Father has accomplished or promised in the Son for us men and our salvation, for all that God is offering to the world in His declared Gospel. And to affirm the absolute and final character of Christianity in this sense merely proves that we understand what Christianity means."

Next after Troeltsch the author places the Theology of Paradox, and the work of Soren Kierkegaard; then, finally, Karl Barth and the Theology of the Word of God. Christian religion is not the aspiration of man to God, but is the condescension of God to man. The Lord, even the Most High God, hath spoken and called the world. Associated with Karl Barth are Thurneysen, Brunner and Gogarten.

Karl Barth's fundamental thought is that Christianity is the Revelation of God, and to that Coming of His Word "we must listen in the attitude of awe, trust and obedience."

Mackintosh's analysis of Karl Barth's writings unhappily did not receive the author's final revision. But what is given is sufficient to draw out the chief value of this latest movement in German religious thought.

The entire volume is a remarkable work, wide in range and penetrating in its criticism. It is a most instructive survey of German thought. It shews how each new school took as its guiding interest those elements in the complex problem which its predecessors had tended to overlook. It displays most impressively, after more than a century of reactions, a return to the original conviction that Christianity is not a mere approach of the human towards the Divine, but a descent of the Divine to the human. W. J. Sparrow Simpson.

The Ministry and the Sacraments. Edited by Dr. R. Dunkerly and Dr. A. C. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester. S.C.M. Press. 18s.

This volume is one of those issued in preparation for the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order, and its form and arrangement are intimately connected with its purpose. It consists in fact of a report on the Ministry and Sacraments approved by a Commission of the Continuation Committee of the Conference, together with a collection of papers written for the same Commission with a view to the issuing of the Report. These papers are the theological and historical basis on which the conclusions of the Report are founded.

It seems best, therefore, to begin with a consideration of this preparatory matter, which is indeed of far more value than the highly condensed and hurriedly written Report which has actually been presented to the Conference. It falls into four divisions. The first, of over two hundred pages, is devoted to accounts of the actual views or doctrines of ministry and sacraments held by the chief Christian communions. The second deals with the Biblical basis of these very variou

conceptions, the third with their development in history, and the fourth consists of two short "constructive statements," together with a review of all the papers by the Bishop of Gloucester, which forms a link between the preliminary studies and the actual Report.

We may notice first that the Roman Church is represented by two articles, and from considerations of balance these are especially valuable. Roman Catholics will not discuss doctrine; and the consequence is that these great "ecumenical" gatherings are always overweighted in the Protestant direction. But Roman theologians are always willing to state the official teaching of the Roman Church with great fullness and accuracy, and the two careful statements on behalf of the Roman Church, the one doctrinal by Dr. Vetter and the other historical by Dr. Stasiewski, deserve careful attention. Three points are worthy of special attention: the disclaimer of any "magical" power in the outward sign of the sacrament, the rejection of the idea that grace is a substance, and the emphasis on the possibility of *Baptismus in voto* when a man in ignorance of the Christian religion turns his whole heart to God. Recognition of these things would prevent much ill-instructed treatment of Catholic theology in the way both of statement and of criticism.

The Orthodox view is fully represented; and we notice at once that there is not perfect unanimity. To Dr. Alivisatos a bishop is a successor of the Apostles, and the three holy Orders are of divine institution: but Fr. Boulgakoff maintains that the three degrees of holy Order were originally absent and that the idea of any continuance of the Apostolic dignity is utterly foreign to Orthodox theology. "Episcopacy," he says, "has *arisen* within the Church through the Church's own power." But both alike would repudiate the idea that the hierarchy is set over the Church in a position of superiority. It merely so happens that in the organic unity of the Church one of their functions is that of government. Dr. Arseniev's article has little connexion with that of the two other Orthodox theologians; it is an appreciation of the Orthodox liturgy, and by far the most beautiful thing in the whole volume.

The Anglican contribution is by Dr. Quick, and its general tenor is to suggest that the official Anglican statements are or ought to be acceptable to theologians generally. He devotes a good deal of space to the clearing up of the concept of *validity* (a word invented by the devil, according to Bishop Palmer). That "'presence . . .' means the potentiality . . . of communion" is becoming a commonplace of Anglican theologians, but it is none the worse for that: indeed it is a good and illuminating definition. But, like other theologians of the same

allegiance, Dr. Quick is perhaps less happy when he philosophizes about " Body," and seems to ignore " Blood."

We come next to the Lutherans. As might be expected, we are at once faced with their traditional emphasis on the *Word*; but there is a world of difference between Dr. Hermelink's presentation and that of Bishop Aulèn. To the former " the sacrament is not specifically different from the Word," and " *therefore* . . . is not a regular form . . . frequently repeated." This is very different from the " rich and many-sided " meaning of the Eucharist in the Church of Sweden. But it should be noted that Swedish Lutheranism always desires to make it clear that it sets little store on any matter connected with the external. If the Word is preached, everything else may be left to settle itself. It is " the Word " rather than " the Body " which is the instrument of God.

The Reformed Churches tend to be obsessed by fear of the phrase *ex opere operato*, which sometimes seems to be hardly understood. We may notice that Calvin himself, quoted by Dr. Vasady on pp. 187-8, states very clearly that even the unworthiness of the recipient can make no difference to the integrity of the sacraments so long as *rite peraguntur*. Here is the *opus operatum* indeed !

Curiously different is Dr. Matthews' exposition of the Baptist position according to which a valid Eucharist is defined as " one in which the recipient himself is in a state of grace ": though here again it is clear that all Baptists do not speak with the same voice on such matters.

When we come to the Methodists (represented for us by the learning and piety of Dr. Flew) we return to a note of enthusiasm and appreciation which recalls Dr. Arseniev's article. Here, we feel, are people who have learned to love and enjoy Holy Communion. Apart from this perhaps the most interesting thing in the article is the information that Dr. Bright's " And now, O Father " is winning its way with the Methodist community. Any one who can use that hymn in the sense in which it was written is neither Protestant, nor Reformed, but Catholic in his appreciation of the Eucharistic idea.

The contribution of the Society of Friends contains nothing unexpected. It is simply a plea to be allowed to abstain from sacraments if we believe that we receive grace more vividly without their aid.

On the other hand, most people on this side of the Atlantic are completely ignorant of the " Disciples, or Churches of Christ." " I guess there's no such thing in England," a Rhodes scholar once said to the reviewer. We find, then, that this community has very pronounced views on the sacramental life

of the Church. While they insist that "the introduction of Infant Baptism was the fundamental error of Christendom," and while they also agree with the Baptists in pressing for immersion in all cases, they maintain a high view of the sacramental efficacy of the rite as actually conveying to the recipient the benefits of Christ's Passion. In like manner the Disciples have restored the Lord's Supper to its position as the central act of Sunday worship, and at the same time have insisted on its truly objective and sacramental character. At the same time they are anxious to give the lay people their full share in public worship and have an arrangement whereby the prayers of the people are first invited and then summed up by the presiding minister. (Dr. Robinson speaks of this as the *Orate, fratres* : but he is clearly thinking of the primitive order for "Collective Prayer." *Orate, fratres* is many centuries later than *Oremus, dilectissimi*.)

We turn next to the Biblical basis, the first and most important section of which is the analysis by Sir Frederick Kenyon and Mr. S. C. E. Legg of the textual data in regard to the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist. Their conclusion is that we clearly have two narratives of the Institution which are original and two which are secondary, and that the earlier and independent witnesses, St. Paul and St. Mark, must be preferred to those which are later and secondary; and therefore the curious variations of the Lucan narrative are of textual rather than historical interest.

This is followed by two articles on Church, Baptism, and Eucharist in the New Testament. The first is by Bishop A. E. J. Rawlinson and is on the whole of a conservative character. The second is by Dr. M. Goguel of Paris. To the plain man this is the least satisfactory essay in the volume. It is in fact impossible to understand it without some acquaintance with M. Goguel's other writing. He constantly makes dogmatic statements which appear to be highly disputable, and refers the reader to some other work of his own for the argument in favour of it. "It is certain that the idea of Jesus' appointing Apostles did not exist at the time when Paul became a Christian." This is the "myth which dominates the Acts." "The special position occupied by Peter is no way the result of a special mission . . . entrusted to him by Jesus." "'He was seen of James' was probably invented by the partisans of James." "In Clement we find no trace of the idea of the Apostolic Succession." "The disciples . . . gradually persuaded themselves that 'in celebrating the Eucharist' they were fulfilling the intentions of their Master; and finally that they were obeying His commands."

Next we have three essays on the origin of the Ministry. The first, by Bishop Headlam, avowedly contains little that is new, and calls for no comment. The second, by Dr. Gerke, is a description of the way by which in the author's opinion the Apostolic conception of the ministerial office passed into that of the Catholic Church. In striking contrast to Dr. Goguel he asserts that the structure of the Primitive Community is determined by the Apostolate of the Twelve. Peter holds a monarchical position. But this Apostolic constitution is altered "by the interference of James." So the Episcopate begins, and later on it is confirmed in its power by the great authority of Rome as displayed in Clement's Epistle. The third, by Bishop Palmer, is the most interesting of the three. It rescues from comparative oblivion the late Mr. Lockton's theory that the Episcopate corresponds to the great Sanhedrim, the presbyterate to the lesser and local Sanhedrims. The Bishop deals with Mr. Lockton's view critically, and it is a great pity that his essay was sent in too late to be considered by the commission which produced the Report.

The last part of the volume consists partly of historical studies, partly of constructive statements. These last, especially the third, which is by Bishop Headlam himself, may almost be considered in the light of draft reports: it is evident that they form the immediate preliminary to the official Report itself.

We come now to this important document, which formed the basis of the relevant part of the report of the Faith and Order Conference. Structurally it consists of short disquisitions followed by statements agreed to by the members of the Commission. On the whole it traverses familiar ground, but there are statements contained in it which seem to invite criticism; and it is interesting to notice that almost all of these are questioned by the only Orthodox member of the Commission, Dr. Arseniev, but not, apparently, by the Old Catholic, Dr. Neufeld. Thus it is stated that no judgment ought to be pronounced by any Church or individual denying the validity (in any of the senses defined above) of the sacraments performed by any Christian body which believes itself to be observing what Christ appointed for His Church. In other words, so long as any group of Christians so believes we must not question the sufficiency of the performance of the outward sacramental signs. Dr. Arseniev wisely prefers to say that we must not question their *effectiveness*. So likewise the same Orthodox theologian finds it impossible to agree to a paragraph which demands "the fullest recognition" of the non-episcopal ministries even though there is agreement that for the future an episcopal ministry is "essential." It will be remembered

that the Faith and Order Conference declined to commit itself to any such statement.

But the Report deserves something better than these cavilling remarks. The unity of outlook attained in this most difficult and controversial subject is in advance of any previous statement. This is seen most clearly in the agreed statement of Eucharistic doctrine. It is true that precise definition is deliberately avoided: but it is very wonderful that so diverse a group of theologians should have agreed that in the Eucharist there is a real presence of Christ and a representation of His sacrifice and that this is the great corporate act of worship of the Christian Church.

There is also some advance in the kind of ministry foreshadowed for a reunited Church. The Lausanne Report professed to recognize that episcopal, presbyteral and congregational elements "must . . . have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church." But it has always been extraordinarily difficult to see how congregationalism can possibly be combined with either or both of the other ministerial systems. The present Report says: "The organization of the United Church . . . would include an Episcopate, constitutional and representative, together with a recognition of the authority of the council of presbyters, and of the Christian laity in the councils of the Church." The sentence is badly drafted; but it appears to mean, as the Lausanne Report probably really meant, that the Bishops are to govern synodically, representing the whole Church and not merely the episcopal Order, and that the *consensus* of the laity should always be obtained. Such government may be called episcopal or presbyterian or both; but it cannot possibly be congregational.

KENNETH BRECHIN.

NOTICES

THE TRANSCENDENCE OF JESUS CHRIST. By F. Cawley, Ph.D. T. and T. Clarke. 9s.

An exceedingly difficult book to appraise. The accents are those of a passionately devout cultured preacher, addressing an intellectual and believing congregation of a type which hardly exists in Anglicanism and makes us realize what Scottish Christians have to give to the Church at large. The preacher hardly argues at all, but paints his picture of Jesus as he sees Him and then shews that this is the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel. The critic's doubts as to the authenticity of this or that detail in the picture are ignored. But the doubter might well read the book with pleasure, "hoping it might be true." A quotation will shew its quality.

"His intrusion upon the soul is the negation of no single right. His inbreaking is of the simplest, most Divine order. He comes but as the dawn knocking upon the gateways of vision. He but knocks as light! But the reverberation of that knocking means more to the soul than the many forcible enterings of all others. They come with their purely relative authority. . . . Their comings and goings in comparison are as the tiny ripples on an otherwise undisturbed ripple of water. But His authority, relative to His own supernal nature and power, is as the tidal surge and urge of lunar forces."

It is nearly all like this. One reader will say: How beautiful and helpful! Another: That doesn't get me any further.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

THE RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. P. G. S. Hopwood, Ph.D. T. and T. Clark. 10s.

Form-criticism has given a new impetus to researches into the dimly lit period of the Church's infancy, and Dr. Hopwood in this book seeks to investigate and describe the original experience that lies behind the faith contained in Scripture and the creeds.

He holds that the experience of the personality of Christ before and after the Resurrection is the sufficient answer to the question, What started the historical processes that we sum up as "Christianity"? Christianity is not a synthesis between Judaism and the Græco-Oriental thought of the Empire (Foakes-Jackson and Lake), nor a product of the unconscious projected on a mythical figure (Jung). "The religious experience which created the Church took its start and derived its sustained inspiration from the vivid awareness of the believers that God had come to their lives in Jesus the Christ as the earnest of their redemption." This explains why the new religion emerged and still lives. The Judaism of John the Baptist spread to Asia Minor (Acts xix. 1-4) and had every opportunity of reaching a synthesis with Græco-Oriental thought; but nothing came of it. Philo fused Jewish and Græco-Oriental thought; but his effort never produced a living religion. The distinctive element in the Christian religion and the historical cause of the emergence and

persistent vitality of Christianity is the religious experience inspired by the creative contacts made with the personality of Jesus.

These very sensible conclusions are reached after a patient investigation of the data provided by the New Testament. Dr. Hopwood admits that the period between the ministry of Jesus and the emergence of the Church as a going concern is "one of almost complete obscurity"; but he believes he can unveil the psychological experiences which are the ultimate data, and disentangle them from later dogmatic and ecclesiastical constructions. It may be doubted whether he always realizes the full weight of his admission, or allows enough for the inevitable subjectivism of his assertions about what the first believers did or did not think. Much of what he says suspiciously echoes the present fashion in moderate left-wing criticism, and the reader is continually reminded of the perennial difficulty of keeping facts and their interpretation in separate compartments.

We are far from saying that the attempt is not worth making, or that Dr. Hopwood has not made a useful contribution to the study of Christian origins. On the contrary, his book contains much that is penetrating and suggestive, and he avoids the trap into which some investigators of Christian origins tumble headlong, the laborious construction of a hypothesis which leaves the appearance of the historic Christian religion an unexplained and unexplainable mystery. Thus he very rightly refuses to leave an unbridged gap between Jesus and the Church, or between Jesus and St. Paul. He maintains that later theology interprets and elucidates the empirical data already given in the primitive Church experience.

But his critical analysis might at times be more critical, and gain thereby. One example must suffice. Arguing against the notion that the Jesus of history and the Christ of experience, the second person of the Trinity, are alien concepts, he says: "The identification of Jesus with the exalted heavenly Messiah of Jewish apocalyptic speculation involved at the outset a remarkable recasting of Jewish thought: the identification was made on a basis of experience of the personal and exalted Jesus." That seems to us to state a sound principle with something less than the necessary precision. It is highly precarious to use so question-begging a term as "identification." Is it possible to say that at any stage the Christians thought of Jesus as exactly the Messiah of, say, the Book of Enoch ?

Dr. Hopwood follows the recent fashion of brushing aside the evidence of St. Paul for the command "Do this in remembrance of Me." He seems to us to fail to make the lame and unconvincing arguments for this procedure any more plausible than other critics have made them.

H. Balmforth.

English Religious Verse. An anthology compiled by G. Lacey May. Dent. 2s.

There have been many religious anthologies since the "Golden Treasury." They necessarily contain many of the same outstanding gems, but each anthology also reflects the idiosyncrasies of the compiler, who sips as he flies the honey that pleases him most. This is true of this addition to Everyman; there are few of the great things missed, and there are things that others than Mr. May would hardly have placed side by side with their great compeers. The selections from the two

great periods, that of Rolle and that of Herbert and Vaughan, are excellent. (Miss Comper's *Spiritual Songs* came out too late for consultation on the former.) The Victorian poets are well done, but there seems to be an over-dose of Whitman. In drawing on modern writers Mr. May is, as he says in his preface, obstructed by "the cost of copyright permissions," which afflicts all anthologizers, who are conscious of the lack of pence which vexes public men. So we have just a snippet of a sonnet from Masefield and Bridges, and less costly pieces of less worthy verse, which somewhat throws the whole presentation of England's music out of gear. It is not quite "ut turpiter atrum desinat in piscem mulier formosa superne"; but yet an enterprising reader comparing on the evidence here presented our efforts of today with those of the great past might be tempted to exclaim, "How are the mighty fallen!"

Mr. May gives an excellent introduction on the uses of religious verse today, and like all the Everymans the book is handy, well-printed and nicely bound.

W. J. Ferrar.

John Donne and the New Philosophy. By Charles Monroe Coffin. Columbia University Press and Humphrey Milford. 17s. 6d.

Dr. Coffin is to be congratulated on a remarkably fine piece of work. In an attempt to elucidate Donne's learning, he has made a thorough study of the works of the scientific Renaissance of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries and has shewn the relationship in which Donne stands to them. The discussion of the background is so painstaking and illuminating that the volume deserves the attention of many more than those specifically interested in the poet-Dean whose name occurs on the title-page. The growth of sixteenth-century science is a fascinating story which seems to be none too well known. Even by writers of eminence it is sometimes believed that Copernicus held his heliocentric theory only as a hypothesis, in view of the fact that the preface to the *De Revolutionibus* defends its hypothetical character, though in actual fact this preface is not due to Copernicus at all but to the Reformation theologian Osiader. The true situation here, as at many other points, is brought out in Dr. Coffin's careful pages. The author also emphasizes the influence exercised by the mathematical tradition of Platonism upon the scientific movement of the period, and enables us to perceive the direct connexion between the mathematical view of modern physics through the Renaissance Platonism with Plato and ultimately with Pythagoras' doctrine of the numerical structure of reality. Among the scientists whose work comes in for consideration are Nicolas of Cusa, the Jesuit Clavius (against whom Donne wrote the work which was Englished as "Ignatius His Conclave"), Tycho Brahe, Kepler, and Galileo. No one interested in the origins of modern European science should miss this volume.

A small point. What is the history of the expression "the New Philosophy," which occurs in Dr. Coffin's title? In the middle of the seventeenth century it was regularly applied to the Cartesian system (constantly, *e.g.*, in Boyle). But is there any evidence of its application to the work of such men as Copernicus? I note that Donne uses the expression "new philosophy" (without the article)—*e.g.*, in two lines quoted by Dr. Coffin on pp. 132 and 140 respectively; but without the article this is not, of course, quite the same thing.

F. L. Cross.

RELIGION AND REALITY. An Essay in the Christian Co-ordination of Contraries. By Melville Chaning-Pearce. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Chaning-Pearce modestly describes himself as "one who is neither a professional theologian nor philosopher" and his work as "the tardy fruit of a lifetime of correlated thought, feeling, study and action." Its keyword is "existentialism," and it might be described either as an existential apologetic for Christianity or as an apologetic for existential Christianity, or perhaps most accurately as an existential apologetic for existential Christianity.

The author's starting-point is the assertion of a fundamental antithesis in our experience between reason and faith or between Mind and Heart, which, he insists, issues for religion in the antithesis between the Jesus of History and the Christ of Faith. Reason or logic—and the terms are generally used as equivalent—can lead us only to the former, and the knowledge of Him that it gives us is practically nil. We know, in Professor Lightfoot's phrase: "little more than the whisper of His voice" and "the outskirts of His ways." But there is a further kind of judgment, existential judgment, which we make not by thinking but by living. It is "the reaction of the whole consciousness to existence," it is an act of the heart or of faith, and the author's argument is that in the light of this existential judgment the Christian religion can make good its claim to acceptance.

It will be evident that this is a work of considerable originality, but it will be well to anticipate one objection which may occur to the superficial reader. The author is not merely a religious pragmatist. He does not merely think that Christianity is a jolly system to practise; he believes that Christianity is true, but that its truth is to be apprehended by living a life rather than by conducting a piece of research. Unfortunately he gives unfamiliar meanings to many of his terms, and in consequence his book may easily seem to be both more original and less orthodox than it actually is. For, when all is said and done, does existentialism really amount to much more than the contention of the Thomists that faith is a kind of knowledge or that the insistence of Pascal that *le cœur a ses raisons que la raison ne connaît point*?

Again, while our knowledge of the Jesus of History is no doubt not so complete as we could wish, we may doubt whether it is really as imperfect as Mr. Chaning-Pearce believes. There are better scholars of Christian origins than Dibelius, Loisy and Freud. But the main criticism to be levelled at the author's work is that he does all his existential thinking on his own—he seems to have no conception of the Mystical Body of Christ which is the Church. In consequence he never really manages to identify the Jesus of History with the Christ of Faith at all—there are two thousand years between them. The Catholic Christian, on the other hand, does his existential thinking as a member of the Body, and to him the Jesus of History is a figure of the present day. And when we remember that Sir Edwyn Hoskyns has irrefragably demonstrated that the Christ of Faith is integral to the earliest Christian tradition, may we not see in the fact of the Church just that link which Mr. Chaning-Pearce needs to make his arguments complete?

E. L. MASCALL.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXV

JULY—DECEMBER, 1937

PAGE

After the Consecration 303
Badcock, F. J. 38
Balmforth, H. 307
Baverstock, A. H. 78
Bell, Bernard Iddings 83
Between the Consecration and the Communion 245
Bible, the Interpretation of Human History, The 141
Books Reviewed:

Altar Missal, The 47
Bible View of Life, The. By S. C. Carpenter 307
First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, The. By W. K. Lowther Clarke . 309
God and the Modern Mind. By Hubert S. Box 120
History of Christian Thought. Edited by E. G. Selwyn 186
Life of Jesus, The. By Conrad Noel 247
Ministry and the Sacraments, The. Edited by Dr. R. Dunkerly and Dr. A. C. Headlam 373
Parish Communion, The. Edited by A. G. Hebert 121
Polycarp's Two Epistles to the Philippians. By P. N. Harrison 367
Reactions in German Religious Thought. By H. R. Mackintosh 370

Bouquet, A. C. 338
Brechin, Bishop of 373
Briscoe, J. F. 183
Butler, F. W. 5
Carpenter, S. C. 247
Clarke, W. K. Lowther 47
Comparative Study of Religions, The 338
Correspondence . . . . . 183, 184, 242 *ff*
Country Clergy of the Restoration Period, The 354
Cowley, Patrick 120, 154, 182
Cratchley, W. J. 211
Crookshank, R. G. 41
Day, E. Hermitage 354
Dean Vaughan and his Men 103
de Candole, H. 300
De Decanis Ruralibus 290
Dictator, A Great 18
Dobbie-Bateman, A. F. 303
Earle, A. 290
Ellwood, Elizabeth 295
Fifth Gospel, The 96
Fisherman's Gospel, The 111
Gates of Hades, The 38, 299, 300
Give a Poor Dog a Bone 237
Godhead of Christ, The 295
Hampden, R. D., The Trials of 211
Harman, A. C. 103
Haslehurst, R. S. T. 96, 163
Healey, Kenneth 301
History and Historic Christianity 5
Hollis, A. M. 30
Holmes-Gore, V. A. 117
Holy Communion or Dis-Union ? 241
Holy Communion, The, Teaching the Sacrifice 230
Hoskyns, Canon Sir Edwyn 135
Incomprehensibility of Mysticism, The 154
Jenkins, Claud E. 367
Judd, A. F. 326
Kingdom and the World, The 226

PAGE
LEE, E. KENNETH 13
LYTTELTON, E. 242
MACGREGOR, GEDDES 361
MARKHAM, ROGER 244
Matthean "Exception," The 296
MAY, G. LACEY 24
MILNER-WHITE, E. 72
MOZLEY, J. K. 141
Notes on Periodicals 45, 118, 304
Our Worship and Our Faith 172
Parable of the Tares, The 117
Parish Communion, The 182, 300
PARKER, J. W. 18, 237
PARSONS, R. E. 121
Passion Play in the Austrian Tyrol, A 349
Pastoral Problems and Theological Study—I., II. 198, 270
Pertinency of the Christian Faith To-day, The 83
PIKE, L. E. H. 230
PITTENGER, W. NORMAN 172
Present State of the Church of England, The 163
PRIDEAUX, S. P. T. 198, 270, 299
Problem of Evil, The 285
PURCHES, S. L. 241
Reformation Portrait Gallery, A 364
Revision of the Prayer Book, The 1928 72
RICHARDSON, ALAN 226
RILEY, ATHELSTAN 262
SAMPSON, ASHLEY 364
SERLE, S. E. B. 300
Simplicity in Worship 180
SIMPSON, W. J. SPARROW 370
SMITH, K. H. NIXON 178
SMYTH, CHARLES 135
Socratic Dialogue on the Existence of Devils, A 262
Some Alternative Blessings 41
Spiritual Master, A 178
Sporting Parson of the Eighteenth Century, The 24
State of Perfection, The 13
STEVENS, T. P. 298
Suggestive Advertisement 43
Sunday Morning Worship 183
TAYLOR, R. O. P. 296
TELFER, W. 309
TOWNER, L. B. 245
Training of the Indian Ministry, The 30, 184
Unjust Steward, The Parable of 78, 242, 298
VALENTINE, CYRIL H. 186
Victorian Compromise, The 326
Whither Reunion 361
WILLIAMS, H. FULFORD 184
WILSON, H. R. 43
WRIGHT, W. S. T. 285
WYATT, E. G. P. 180

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher